



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

C 9019.07.5

Harvard College Library



FROM THE BEQUEST OF
JOHN HARVEY TREAT.
OF LAWRENCE, MASS.
(Class of 1862)

Rec'd

LITURGICAL STUDIES

LITURGICAL STUDIES

BY

THE VERY REV. VERNON STALEY


PROVOST OF THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF
ST. ANDREW, INVERNESS

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

1907

C 9019.07.5



Treat fund

PREFACE

WITH one exception, the following articles have appeared during the last five years in the columns of *The Guardian* and of *The Church Times*. Through the courtesy of the Editors of these papers, I am enabled to present them to the public collected in one volume. This has been done at the suggestion of Dr. John Dowden, Bishop of Edinburgh, to whom I am indebted for much kindness and encouragement in the pursuit of studies in Liturgy. The fourth essay on "The Origin of Saints' Days" has not hitherto appeared in print.

INVERNESS,

July 1, 1907.

CONTENTS

I	
NATIONAL CEREMONIES CONSISTENT WITH CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES	PAGE 1
II	
NOTES ON THE KALENDAR OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH	17
III	
THE ORIGIN OF THE FESTIVAL OF THE MAGI . . .	29
IV	
THE ORIGIN OF SAINTS' DAYS	38
V	
ST. ENURCHUS—A LITURGICAL PROBLEM	58
VI	
THE COMMEMORATION OF KING CHARLES THE MARTYR	66
VII	
THE OCCURRENCE OF FESTIVALS AND HOLY DAYS .	84
VIII	
THE LENT FAST—ITS ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT .	105

IX

<i>TE DEUM</i> AND <i>BENEDICTUS</i> AND ALTERNATIVE CANTICLES	123
---	-----

X

A LITURGICAL PERPLEXITY	147
-----------------------------------	-----

XI

THE OCCASIONAL PRAYERS	162
----------------------------------	-----

XII

ON CERTAIN EUCHARISTIC "AMENS"	171
--	-----

XIII

PRAYER-BOOK REVISION	189
--------------------------------	-----

XIV

POSTURE OF THE MINISTER DURING THE READING OF THE COLLECTS	205
---	-----

<i>Note on the Minister's Posture at the Collects</i>	214
---	-----

INDEX	219
-----------------	-----

LITURGICAL STUDIES

I

NATIONAL CEREMONIES CONSISTENT WITH CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES

A PRAISEWORTHY desire to assert the catholicity of the English Church, and its identity in essentials with that portion of the Church Catholic which yields obedience to the Roman See, has led certain Anglicans in recent times to maintain that, in order to make this assertion effectively, it is most desirable, if not necessary, that the English Church should adopt the ceremonies which obtain in the larger portion of the Western Church. That the English ceremonies of religion should differ from those of the rest of the Western Church appears to some minds to imply that the English Church

B

is not Catholic, but merely insular and even Protestant. Any such variations are regarded in certain quarters as monstrosities, to be carefully shunned by those who have the welfare of the Church at heart. It is urged that if the English Church is Catholic she must, as such, manifest her catholicity by adopting the ceremonies in use in the rest of the Catholic West. If she is singular in this matter, it has been held that she stultifies and forfeits her claim to be considered Catholic in any true sense of this august term.

To this idea, which has obtained a lodgment in the minds of some, the introduction during the last fifty years of certain ornaments of the church and of the ministers and certain ceremonies in not a few English churches owes its origin. In the larger number of cases, the arrangements and usages to which reference is made have been adopted or copied in simple ignorance of the source from which they are primarily derived. Anglican traditions, in some instances of greater age than those of foreign growth which have been suffered to supplant them, have been ruthlessly discarded and ignored

in favour of an appeal to the authority and custom of the Roman Church. The clergy who, from a sense of duty and loyalty, have maintained and upheld the Anglican usages have been styled "groovey," and even "Prayer-bookky;" they have been looked upon as narrowly English rather than Catholic, and regarded as retarding, if not actually opposing, the reunion of Christendom. In short, it has been assumed and asserted that the observation of national ceremonies is inconsistent with the maintenance of Catholic principles.

Now the assumption or assertion stated above, it is hoped without exaggeration, can only be made in ignorance of and pressed in the teeth of the clearest historical facts abundantly testified; and this we will proceed to demonstrate.

I. In the first place, it is submitted that the idea of the opponents of national variations in religious ceremonial, set forth above, does not agree with the view of the subject deliberately adopted by the English Church from the time of the Reformation in the sixteenth century onwards. This is obvious to any one who

cares to examine what she authoritatively states in reference to the matter in hand. In the year 1549 the First Prayer-book of Edward VI. appeared, at the conclusion of which was printed the apology of the then Reformers for the alterations made at that time in the external ceremonies of the Church of England, under the heading *Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retayned*. This apology has remained unchanged, with the exception of a few insignificant verbal variations, in each successive revision of the Book of Common Prayer. It may then be taken to represent the deliberately formed expression of the mind of the English Church during the more than three and a-half centuries down to the present day. At the conclusion of this statement, in justification of the general principles upon which in 1549 ceremonial changes were made, we read :—

“ And in these all our dooynges wee condemne no other nacions, nor prescribe anye thyng, but to oure owne people onelye. For we thinke it conueniente that euery countreye should vse such ceremonies, as thei shal thynke beste to the setting foorth of goddes honor and glorye: and to the reducyng of

the people to a moste perfecte and Godly liuing, without errour or supersticion : and that they shoulde putte awaye other thynges, which from time to time they perceiue to be most abused, as in mennes ordinaunces it often chaūceth dyuerslye in diuerse countreyes.”¹

Here we have evidence of the temperate spirit which lay behind the ceremonial modifications of 1549, and also of the full rights of national Churches in making such changes in externals as may from time to time for good cause be deemed expedient. At the same time, words of caution are previously used, urging reverence for antiquity and deprecating unnecessary innovations. The principles enunciated in the preface *Of Ceremonies* are sound principles.

Thirteen years later a similar assertion of the rights of national Churches in the ordering of their own ceremonial was made by the English Church in the “Articles agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces and the whole clergy, in the Convocation holden at London in the year 1562.”

¹ *The First Prayer-book of Edw. VI.*, De la More Press, 1903 ; p. 372.

The thirty-fourth Article, *Of the Traditions of the Church*, states :—

“It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like ; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men’s manners, so that nothing be ordained against God’s word.”

Here a check is rightly placed upon any alteration in regard to the outward signs or actions of the sacraments as instituted by our Lord. The Article concludes :—

“Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man’s authority, so that all things be done to edifying.”

Now, this Article lays down a principle which, without doing violence to language, may be called a Catholic principle. It not only accurately states an historical fact which is capable of abundant proof, but it also gives expression in carefully chosen words to teaching which is very ancient and widespread—teaching which can claim a large amount of authority from the writings of the Fathers

and Doctors of the Church of acknowledged repute.

II. The assumption that uniformity in customs and ceremonial usages has ever prevailed in the West is contrary to fact. In spite of the most strenuous efforts on the part of the Roman Court to impress ceremonial uniformity upon the whole Roman Church, even at the present day such efforts have been but partially successful. Such a rigid uniformity does not now exist, and never has existed, abroad. For example, the most cursory examination of De Moleon's *Voyages Liturgiques de France*, published at Paris in 1718, will convince the most sceptical person of the fact that a wide divergence in ceremonial existed in the churches of France at the close of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries. Le Brun Desmarettes, the author, wrote as an eye-witness, describing what he saw during an ecclesiological tour, in the course of which he visited some of the most important ecclesiastical centres of France. In the face of facts such as those described in the work alluded to, it is not unreasonable to require

those who would demand the conformity of English ceremonial to Roman to say what they mean by Roman ceremonial, and to explain how it is that in some important details a certain amount of diversity at present prevails abroad, as has always been the case in regard to the ceremonies of the Western Church. Are we in England required to use the ceremonies which obtain in the city of Rome, or those which obtain at Milan, at Lyons, at Toledo, or at Seville? Do they mean the ceremonies of the Franciscans, the Carthusians, or the Dominicans, which vary considerably the one from the others? When the objectors to national ceremonial have given their answer, it will be time enough to proceed further in the discussion as to how far it is desirable for Anglicans to conform to Western ceremonial usages. The process of conformity receives a rude check at the very start. There is, in fact, no uniform standard of Western usage which can be set up as a model for our imitation.

To make the writer's meaning quite clear, it will suffice to take one example out of many

which might be adduced—the usage of the Carthusians in the matter of genuflections by the priest during Mass, ordered in the rubrics of the Roman Missal. At the present day, and for more than three centuries past, the celebrant in the Carthusian Mass does not in this matter strictly conform to the letter of the rubrics of the Roman Missal of Pius V. :—

“It is commonly understood,” says Father Thurston, “that the Carthusian priest does not in any proper sense genuflect while saying Mass (*nunquam in genua procumbit*). . . . There can be no reasonable doubt that, even if in the slight bending of the knees now practised in the Carthusian churches, they may have yielded something to the changing ritual of the rest of the world, their custom of not bowing the knee to the ground during Mass is a survival of what in former times was the universal usage.”¹

III. It remains to demonstrate that there is nothing inconsistent with Catholic principles in national diversities of religious observances and ceremonies.

Irenaeus, who was Bishop of Lyons in

¹ Fr. Thurston, “Genuflexion at Mass,” in *The Month*, October, 1897, p. 400.

France during the last quarter of the second century, in allusion to variations concerning the time of keeping Easter and the preceding Lent fast, wrote :—

“The controversy is not merely as regards the day, but also as regards the form itself of the fast. For some consider themselves bound to fast one day, others two days, others still more, while others do so during forty. And this variety among the observers had not its origin in our time, but long before in that of our predecessors. . . . And yet, nevertheless, all these lived in peace one with another, and we also keep peace together. Thus, in fact, the difference in observing the fast establishes the harmony of our common faith. . . . Those who did not keep the feast in this [the Roman] way were peacefully disposed towards those who came to them from other dioceses in which it was so observed . . . and none were ever cast out of the Church for this matter.”¹

Irenaeus then proceeds to record a pleasant incident—namely, that when Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, had occasion to visit Rome (A.D. 160), to confer with Pope Anicetus on other

¹ *The Writings of Irenaeus*, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1883; Vol. II., pp. 159, 160. The quotation above refers to a matter of discipline rather than of ceremonial, but it affords evidence upon the principle contended for—questions of discipline being of greater moment than those of ceremonial.

matters, he discovered that the rule of the Asiatic Churches, in the matter just alluded to, differed from that of the Roman Church. The two prelates alike claimed apostolic authority, that of St. Peter and St. John respectively, and, therefore, each forebore from pressing a rival claim; whilst Anicetus courteously permitted Polycarp to enjoy the privilege of consecrating the Eucharist in his presence,¹ in token of good fellowship. In this instance we have most important evidence of the fact that a wide divergence in a matter of religious observance of considerable moment between particular Churches was not regarded by two eminent prelates as any bar to Catholic communion.

In the year 413, or perhaps a little earlier, St. Augustine of Hippo wrote an epistle to one Casulanus on the subject of the observance of the Saturday fast, in which he says:—

“Let the faith of the whole Church, how wide soever it have spread itself, be always one, although

¹ *The Writings of Irenaeus*, p. 161. It is not improbable that this episode had much to do with the decree of the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, that if a foreign prelate were present at the celebration of the Eucharist, he should be the consecrator.

the unity of belief be famous for variety of certain ordinances, whereby that which is rightly believed suffereth no kind of let or impediment.”¹

Sozomen, who flourished in the first half of the fifth century, wrote :—

“Different customs prevail in many Churches where the same doctrines are received :”

Amongst other differences he names the following :—

“Another custom prevails at Alexandria, which I have never witnessed nor heard of elsewhere, and this is, that when the Gospel is read, the Bishop does not rise from his seat. The Archdeacon alone reads the Gospel in this city, whereas in some places it is read by the deacons, and in others only by the presbyters ; while in many churches it is read on stated days by the Bishops ; as, for instance, at Constantinople, on the first day of the festival of the Resurrection.”²

In the following century, A.D. 591, Pope Gregory the Great wrote a long letter to Leander, Metropolitan Bishop of Seville, in Spain, concerning the mode of administering

¹ *Cited in* Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.*, Ed. Church and Paget, Seventh Ed., Clarendon Press, 1888 ; Bk. IV., ch. xiii. sec. 3.

² Sozomen, *Eccles. Hist.*, Bk. VII., c. 19.

Baptism; and, on the ground that threefold immersion was then the Arian custom in that country, he urged that it would be well henceforth to allow or encourage but single immersion only. Gregory's words breathe a charitable and peaceable spirit:—

“Where the faith of holy Church is one, a difference in customs of the Church doth no harm.”¹

In the year 601 were written the memorable replies of Gregory the Great to the questions put to him by St. Augustine of Canterbury in reference to the English Mission. As St. Augustine travelled with his companions through Gaul to Britain he observed certain peculiarities in the Gallic ritual and ceremonial. From this observation, which evidently greatly perplexed him, he was led to ask—

“Why, seeing that the faith is one, are there different customs in different Churches, and one custom of Masses in the holy Roman Church, another in that of Gaul?”²

Upon this interesting inquiry Dr. Bright³ remarks:—

¹ *Epist.*, Bk. I., p. 41, cited in Hooker, IV., xiii., 3.

² Bede, *Eccles. Hist.*, Bk. I., ch. 27.

³ *Early Eng. Ch. Hist.*, Clarendon Press, 1888; p. 59.

“ In Gaul he had evidently noticed the number of collects in the Mass, the frequent variations of the Preface, the invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements, the solemn episcopal blessing pronounced after the breaking of the Bread, and before ‘the Peace’ and the Communion. Gregory, who was deeply interested in liturgical questions, and had revised and re-edited the ‘Sacramentary’ of his predecessor, Gelasius, and brought the Eucharistic ceremonial to what he considered an elaborate perfection, was at the same time far from being a pedant or a bigot on such points : he advised, on the contrary, a wise eclecticism.”

St. Augustine was advised thus :—

“ Whatever you find either in the Roman or Gallican, or any other Church, which may be more pleasing to Almighty God, I think it best that you should carefully select it, and settle it in the Use of the Church of the English newly converted to the faith. Therefore you may collect out of every Church whatever things are pious, religious, and right. . . .”¹

In the foregoing quotations, which might be largely supplemented from later writers, we have evidence of the highest order that, during the first six centuries of the Christian era, national variations in external observances were

¹ Bede, *Eccles. Hist.*, Bk. I., ch. 27.

considered quite consistent with Catholic principles. The space at the writer's disposal only permits of further allusion to the writings of Cardinal Bona, who died at Rome in the year 1674. In his well-known treatise on liturgiology¹ he devotes a chapter to the matter treated of in this article, in the course of which he quotes a number of ancient authors to prove that variety in liturgical arrangements has at various times been more than tolerated ; giving his reasons for the same toleration. Richard Hooker,² in his controversy with the Puritans, also treats of the same subject with his usual sagacity and moderation, from another point of view.

We cannot bring our remarks to a close in a better way than by giving the opinion of Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, upon the subject under review :—

“The indwelling of God the Holy Ghost will illumine the minds of the different nations without

¹ Bona, *Opera Omnia*, Antwerp, 1739 ; *Rerum Liturgicarum*, lib. i., cap. 6. *Diversas Ecclesiarum consuetudines in Missae celebratione olim fuisse, et nunc esse.*

² *Eccles. Pol.*, IV., xiii.

destroying their national characteristics, and therefore we shall not be surprised to find many marked peculiarities in the services and ceremonies of the different Churches throughout the world." ¹

¹ Forbes, *Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles*, Third Ed., Oxford, 1878 ; Art. xxxiv., p. 672.

II

NOTES ON THE KALENDAR OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH

THE history of the compilation of the Kalendar of the English Church is exceedingly complicated, and is involved in much obscurity. Many attempts have been made, but in vain, to discover the leading principles, if any, which were followed by the compilers of the Kalendar of the Book of Common Prayer, as it now stands. With our present knowledge we can only confess that, regarding the Kalendar as a whole, it is impossible to trace any consistent line, not only with reference to the names of the events which are included and those which are excluded, but also as to the classification of red-letter and black-letter commemorations. In regard to the red-letter days, the most that can be said is, that there appears to have been

C

present in the minds of the compilers of the Kalendar, as it was finally fixed, an intention to commemorate specially only such persons and events as are named in the New Testament. This is in keeping with the general intention of the Reformers in other matters, the appeal to Holy Scripture being a conspicuous feature of their efforts. But the omission from the list of red-letter days of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin to St. Elizabeth, which was the occasion of the utterance of the *Magnificat*, and therefore an occasion of the highest importance, and the omission of the Transfiguration of our Lord, likewise an occasion of supreme importance—in spite of both these events possessing biblical authority—these omissions are, on this theory, puzzling inconsistencies. Other similar inconsistencies in the way of the total omission of New Testament names of repute are noticed below.

Putting aside for the moment the idea of biblical influence in the selection of feasts, there is a certain amount of evidence of a negative kind, that the English Kalendar was compiled

from the Kalendars of the Sarum Missal and Breviary. For example :—

(1) We observe the omission of certain New Testament saints, notably St. Joseph, the foster-father of our Lord; and St. Joseph of Arimathea, who played so prominent a part in His burial. The omission of these great names, so closely connected with the history of our Lord's incarnate life, is sufficiently remarkable; but both were absent from the Sarum Kalendar and the majority of the older English Church Kalendars. The close association of both these saints with our Lord makes the omission greatly to be regretted. On the other hand, it is exceedingly perplexing to find the name of St. Anne, of whom nothing certain is known, whilst that of St. Joseph of Bethlehem, of whom we are told so much in the New Testament, is wanting.

(2) In the English Kalendar there is an absence of the names of Scottish and Irish saints, such as St. Ninian, St. Columba, St. Aidan, and St. Patrick. These omissions we inherit from the Sarum Kalendar, which, however, quite inconsistently, includes St. Bridget.

(3) Such great Western names as St. Anselm, St. Bernard, and St. Thomas Aquinas, are wanting in the English Kalendar ; but again we do not find these commemorations in the Sarum Kalendar.

(4) Finally, there is in our Kalendar a most regrettable absence of Eastern saints, such as the following, all of whom find a place in the present Roman Kalendar, namely, St. Athanasius, St. Basil the Great, St. Chrysostom, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Ignatius of Antioch, and St. Polycarp. The two great fathers, Athanasius and Chrysostom, are, however, recognised in the Book of Common Prayer, though not in the Kalendar. Many more great names of saints might be added from Eastern sources. Strange to say, all except St. Basil were absent from the Sarum Kalendar ; hence, apparently, our loss.

The foregoing omissions afford strong evidence, of a negative kind, that the Kalendar of the Book of Common Prayer was compiled from the Sarum books. There is also similar evidence in regard to the insertion of the black-letter commemorations in A.D.

1561, to which reference will be made later.

An examination of the Kalendar of the Book of Common Prayer shows that—excluding from our reckoning all Sundays and the movable feasts (viz. Ascension day, the Mondays and Tuesdays after Easter day and Whit-sunday), and the movable fasts (viz. Ash Wednesday, the Ember and the Rogation days)—there are now ninety holy days set down in the Kalendar of the English Church. Of this number, twenty-four¹ are red-letter or major holy days, on which some person or event mentioned in the New Testament is commemorated; whilst sixty-six² are black-letter or minor holy days, on which some less important person or event connected with the New Testament, or some person or event of a later date than the period covered by the New Testament, is commemorated. The black-letter commemorations include the period which reaches from the time of St. John the Baptist to that of St. Richard, Bishop of Chichester, who

¹ Not reckoning K. Charles, the Martyr.

² O Sapientia excluded.

died in the middle of the thirteenth century; and they are of wide geographical distribution.

The red-letter holy days have remained unchanged in number since the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., A.D. 1549, with but three exceptions, namely:—(1) The name of St. Barnabas was omitted from the Kalendar of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI., A.D. 1552, though the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel were given in that book. This omission has been often attributed to a printer's error, though it is not easy to prove that such was the case. But it is to be remembered that, for some reason or other, the name of St. Barnabas never enjoyed a very secure position in the English Kalendar; in fact, quite a fatality appears to have attached itself in regard to the observance of his commemoration.¹ (2) In the Prayer Book of 1549 St. Mary Magdalene was commemorated on July 22 as a red-letter holy day, with its appropriate Collect, Epistle, and Gospel. In our present Kalendar, St. Mary Magdalene is a black-letter holy day.

¹ See Staley, *The Fasting Days*, Mowbrays, 1899; pp. 35-36.

(3) In the Kalendar of the Prayer Book of 1662, King Charles the Martyr is commemorated as a red-letter holy day on January 30, the date of his martyrdom.

The changes in the list of black-letter holy days are more numerous. In the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI., of 1552, there were but four black-letter holy days, namely :—St. George, April 23; Lammas, August 1; St. Lawrence, August 10; and St. Clement, November 23. In the year A.D. 1561, a commission, consisting of Archbishop Parker, Bishop Grindal, Dr. William Bill, the Queen's Almoner, and Walter Haddon, one of the Masters of Requests, was appointed to consider the Lectionary and indirectly the Kalendar;¹ and the result of its deliberations was the addition to the four days just named of all the black-letter holy days which now appear in the present Kalendar, with the following exceptions, namely:—St. Enurchus, September 7, was added in 1604, in all probability, as I have shown elsewhere in this volume,²

¹ Cardwell, *Documentary Annals*, LV.

² *St. Enurchus, a Liturgical Problem.*

to secure the keeping of Queen Elizabeth's birthday, which fell on that date, in the succeeding reign; whilst the Venerable Bede, May 27; and St. Alban, June 17; as also King Charles the Martyr, January 30; were added in 1662.¹ The first three of these four additions were almost certainly borrowed from the Kalendar of the *Preces Privatae* of 1564.² The peculiarities of May 27 instead of May 26, for Bede; June 17 instead of the usual June 22, for St. Alban; St. Enurchus instead of the true spelling St. Evurtius; all occur in the Kalendar of the *Preces Privatae*. It is interesting to observe that these three latest additions commemorate respectively, one Gallican, one English, and one British saint.

It is exceedingly difficult to determine on what principles the four commissioners proceeded in compiling the list of black-letter or

¹ As to why St. Cuthbert, an English saint of wide reputation, commemorated on March 20th in the Sarum Kalendar, was not added at this time, it is difficult to explain. Possibly the pillage of his shrine in the reign of Henry VIII. may account for the omission. See *The Rites of Durham*, Surtees Soc., 1842; p. 85.

² I have set forth the evidence for this conclusion at some length in *The Liturgical Year*, Mowbrays, 1907; pp. 40 ff.

minor saints' days, which we find in our present Kalendar. The selection has, to say the least, an appearance of caprice and inconsistency which is almost, if not altogether, impossible to justify. Wheatly gives a series of reasons, in his opinion, for the restoration of the minor holy days : he says—

“ The reasons why the names of these Saints-days and Holy-days were resumed into the Kalendar are various ; some of them being retained upon account of our *Courts of Justice*, which usually make their returns on these days, or else upon the days before or after them, which are called in the writs, *Vigil. Fest. or Crast.* as in *Vigil. Martin ; Fest. Martin ; Crast. Martin ;* and the like. Others are probably kept in the Kalendar for the sake of such tradesmen, handicraftsmen, and others, as are wont to celebrate the memory of their tutelar saints : as the *Welshmen* do of *St. David*, the shoemakers of *St. Crispin*, etc. And again, churches being in several places dedicated to some or other of these saints, it has been the usual custom in such places to have *Wakes* or *Fairs* kept upon these days : so that the people would probably be displeased if, either in this or the former case, their favourite saint's name should be left out of the Kalendar. Besides, the histories which were writ before the Reformation do frequently speak of transactions happening upon such a holy-day, or about such

a time, without mentioning the month ; relating one thing to be done as *Lammas-tide*, and another about *Martinmas*, etc., so that were these names quite left out of the Kalendar we might be at a loss to know when several of these transactions happened. But for this and the foregoing reasons our second reformers under Queen Elizabeth thought convenient to restore the names of them to the Kalendar, though not with any regard of being kept holy by the Church.”¹

But it has been pointed out that there are days commemorated in the English Kalendar which cannot be classed under any of the heads named by Wheatly, being useful neither for lawyers or tradesmen, nor for wakes and fairs, nor are they names in which churches are dedicated, such as St. Prisca, St. Nicomede, St. Evurtius, etc. The true estimate of the motives which prompted the restoration of the minor holy days is probably to be found in the answer which the bishops in the year 1661 gave to the Puritans, who desired that these days should be left out—

“The other names are left in the Kalendar, not that they should be so kept as holy days, but they

¹ Wheatly, *A Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer*, Lond., 1840 ; ch. i. pt. ii., p. 54.

are useful for the preservation of their memories, and for other reasons, as for leases, law-days, etc.¹

In pre-Reformation service-books holy days were distinguished and classified according to the number of lessons read at Mattins, which was either three or nine, and feasts were designated in the Kalendars of the Missal and Breviary as Feasts of Three Lessons or of Nine Lessons accordingly. Broadly speaking, the holy days in the Kalendar of the Book of Common Prayer correspond to the Feasts of Nine Lessons in the Sarum books. It does not seem improbable that the compilers of the Kalendar of 1561, which is practically our present Kalendar, took the Feasts of Nine Lessons in the Sarum books as their working basis, making such modifications as they felt desirable; though this theory by no means disposes of all difficulties and inconsistencies as to omissions and additions which are presented to students of the Kalendar of the Prayer Book.²

¹ Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, pp. 306, 341.

² See the Rev. F. E. Warren's article on *The Kalendar* in *Hierurgia Anglicana*, ed. Staley, Delamore Press, 1904;

“Isolated as has been the position of the Anglican Church for three centuries, there is still in the Kalendar a bond of union with the Catholic Church which may one day be renewed as it was of old. The Eastern, African, Spanish, Roman, and Gallican Churches are all represented in it, and as we turn from one venerable name to another we are carried from century to century, from land to land, yet in all is displayed the same unity of faith, the same holy life, the same blessed death. Thus, even in its present imperfect state does the Kalendar become to us an epitome of the Catholic Church, the communion of saints.”

Part III., pp. 251 ff., where this idea is fully exhibited. I have to acknowledge my obligations to Mr. Warren's article in other ways in the foregoing essay.

¹ *Fustorum Semita*, Edin., 1843; Vol. I., the Kalendar, pp. xxxvii, xxxviii.

III

THE ORIGIN OF THE FESTIVAL OF THE MAGI

It is well known to students of liturgiology that the commemoration of the Visit of the Wise Men to Bethlehem on the Feast of Epiphany is not the event most anciently connected with that festival; and that it only came into prominence in the West during the fourth century, gradually assuming a position analogous in importance to the Eastern commemoration of our Lord's Nativity and of His Baptism, which were believed to have happened on the same day, twenty-nine years apart,¹ and which two events were at first commemorated together on January 6th. In the East our Lord's Baptism with its accompanying Theophanies was and still is alone

¹ Literally interpreting St. Luke iii. 23, *cf.* verses 21, 22.

emphasised on that day ; in the West, since the fourth century, the emphasis is laid upon the Visit of the Magi, as in the Book of Common Prayer. How did this most remarkable variation of emphasis and idea come to prevail ?

There is a tradition that early in the fourth century the bodies of the Wise Men were discovered by St. Helena in the East,¹ and we are told that the Emperor Constantine the Great had possession of these relics, and that they were placed in the basilica of St. Sophia in Constantinople.² Later, Constantine sent a Prefect to Milan, named Eustorgius, who was received by the Milanese with great favour ; so much so, that he was eventually chosen and consecrated Bishop of the Church in Milan. The conduct of the Milanese so greatly pleased Constantine that, to show his appreciation of the reception accorded to his Legate, he permitted Eustorgius to have possession of the relics of the Wise Men.³ Accordingly, he sent

¹ Moroni, *Dizionario di Erudizione Storico-Ecclesiastica*, Vol. XIV., pp. 268, 269.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. XLI., pp. 300, 301 ; Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. of Christian Antiq.*, Vol. I., p. 621, sub "Epiphany."

³ Moroni, *ibid.* ; Smith, *Dict. of the Bible*, Vol. II. p. 193.

them to Milan on the occasion of the consecration of Eustorgius, where they found a resting-place, remaining there till A.D. 1162, when the city fell into the hands of Frederic Barbarossa, who transferred them to Cologne. At the present day, on the southern outskirts of Milan, stands the ancient church of S. Eustorgio, founded in the fourth century, and originally dedicated in the name of the Holy Magi Kings.¹ In this church the relics of the Magi were preserved on their removal from Constantinople. The present church of S. Eustorgio, a re-erection in the thirteenth century, contains frescoes at the high altar representing scenes from the history of the Magi, thus testifying to the old tradition.

Placido Puccinelli of Pescia² says that Eustorgius was sent by the Emperor Constantine as Legate to Lombardy, and that on the death of Merocles, A.D. 315, he was named as his successor in the See of Milan by popular

sub "Magi;" Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible*, Vol. III., p. 206, *sub* "Magi."

¹ Moroni, Vol. XLV., p. 39.

² *Zodiaco della Chiesa Milanese*, "Vita di S. Eustorgio," pp. 161, 174.

acclamation. Puccinelli states that Eustorgius craved from the Emperor the custody of the relics of the Three Kings, and, being a great favourite at the Byzantine Court, he obtained his request, and was permitted to carry them to Milan. This event seems to have taken place in A.D. 316, the year after Eustorgius's consecration as Bishop of Milan. S. Eustorgio is the oldest church in that city. St. Ambrose, whose immediate predecessor was Auxentius, who held the See of Milan from A.D. 355 to 374, names Eustorgius as one of his predecessors,¹ placing him between Merocles, A.D. 304-15, and Dionysius, A.D. 346—? Mabillon² follows Tillemont³ partially, assigning the ninth place to Eustorgius, and placing him between Prostasius and Dionysius. Without doubt, Eustorgius was consecrated Bishop of Milan during the lifetime of Constantine, who died A.D. 337. The date assigned to his consecration is A.D. 315, and he held the See for seventeen years, dying in A.D. 333. It appears

¹ *Opp.* III., p. 920. Smith and Wace, *Dict. of Christian Biography*, II., 393, sub "Eustorgius 2."

² *Museum Italicum*, Tom. I. pars altera, p. 110. *Index Episcoporum Mediolanensis.*

³ *Mémoire*, Tom. VI., p. 31.

to be certain that Eustorgius translated the relics of the Magi to Milan in the year A.D. 316, or thereabouts. Moroni, who has much to tell about these relics, states that Pope Julius (A.D. 336–352) instituted the festival of the Magi,—a date which allows time for the commemoration to have secured sufficiently strong footing in Italy, before being formally recognised at Rome.¹

Later in the same century, and very early in the next, the commemoration of the Visit of the Magi on January 6th definitely and prominently emerges in the West in the writings of Maximus, Bishop of Turin,² a city near to Milan, and of St. Chrysostom, who, be it noted, was Bishop of Constantinople A.D. 398–404. The first of these Fathers names three events as commemorated on the Epiphany—the Visit of the Magi, the Baptism of Christ, and the miracle at Cana.³ We have also the authority of St. Paulinus of Nola (c. A.D. 595) in confirmation of this triple commemoration.⁴ St. Augustine has six sermons in *Epiphania*

¹ Moroni, *Dizion.*, Vol. IV., p. 279. ² *Homil. ad Epiph.*, 7.

³ Max. Taur., *Homil.* 29.

⁴ *Carm.* ix. *de S. Felice*.

Dñi,¹ which I have examined, in which the Visit of the Magi is the leading topic, nothing being said about the Baptism of our Lord—a most remarkable testimony to the fact that the commemoration of the Magi had come to overshadow that of the Baptism of our Lord. In one of these sermons,² St. Augustine observes that the commemoration of the Magi on the Epiphany was regarded by the Donatists as an innovation—"Merito istum diem nunquam nobiscum haeretici Donatistae celebrare voluerunt : quia nec unitatem amant, nec Orientali Ecclesiae, ubi apparuit illa stella, communicant. Nos autem manifestationem Domini et Salvatoris nostri Iesu Christi, qua primitias gentium delibavit, in unitate gentium celebremus." As the Donatist schism dates from A.D. 306,³ we have another independent indication of the period when the Visit of the Magi began to be commemorated with emphasis on January 6th. St. Augustine's connexion with Milan was very close, for he was baptized by St. Ambrose in that city at a time when the

¹ Serm. 199-204.

² Serm. 202, ii.

³ Newman, *Arians of Fourth Century*, p. 398.

relics of the Magi were resting there, and he must have been well acquainted with the history of their translation from Constantinople.

Taken as a whole, the evidence set forth above appears to shed considerable light upon the origin of the Western commemoration of the Visit of the Magi on the festival of the Epiphany, and it explains quite naturally how this commemoration came to supersede and overshadow the earlier Eastern commemoration of our Lord's Baptism upon that day; whilst the event of the translation of their relics from the basilica of St. Sophia at Constantinople to the church of the Holy Magi Kings at Milan gives adequate reason for the precedence henceforth given in the West to this commemoration of the Magi over that of our Lord's Baptism, which was previously, as it still is, emphasised at least in the East. The dates are consistent throughout, and we are led to the conclusion that it was in the city of Milan, about the year A.D. 316, that the festival of the Magi took its rise. We have ample evidence that the translation of the relics of saints from their burial or resting-

places to churches dedicated to their memory, as in the case of the relics of the Magi, and the annual observation of such translations and dedications, was the origin of not a few of the Saints' Days of the Kalendar. Duchesne, in his *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, gives several instances of this ; and, moreover, we have very near the date we speak of the example of the origin of the celebration of the festival of the Invention of the Cross, commemorated in the Kalendar on May 3rd. We read that this festival was kept in A.D. 335, when the churches built by Constantine were consecrated in his presence, in connection with St. Helena's discovery of the Cross, and the solemn depositing of it in the church built to receive it. What is now needed is for some scholar to discover the actual day upon which either Eustorgius was consecrated,¹ or the relics of the Magi arrived at Milan, or the relics were solemnly transferred to the church of the Holy Magi Kings, afterwards known as the church of

¹ Mabillon states that Eustorgius's predecessor died "viii. Kal. Dec."—an interval sufficient to allow of a new election and consecration to the See to take place before the feast of the Epiphany.

S. Eustorgio, or the day upon which that church was dedicated. If it should be ascertained that any of these events happened on January 6th, I think the evidence in favour of my conclusion would be complete. Even if no connexion can be shown between any of the events named and January 6th, it can hardly be doubted that the translation of the relics of the Wise Men from Constantinople to Milan and the dedication of a church to their memory in so famous a city had great influence in the allocation, or at least in the spread and popularising of the festival of the Epiphany as commemorative of their visit to Bethlehem.

Since writing the foregoing, the Bishop of Salisbury has drawn my attention to a passage in Baümer's *History of the Breviary*¹ in which reference is made to a set of Antiphons and Responsories on an Egyptian papyrus of the beginning of the fourth century, referring to the Birth of Christ, the Star of the Magi, and the Baptism of Christ, apparently used on the Epiphany at that date.

¹ *Histoire du Bréviaire*, par Dom S. Baümer, translated from the German by Dom R. Biron, Vol. I., ch. ii. p. 85 and note.

IV

THE ORIGIN OF SAINTS' DAYS

IN the course of my studies in the Kalendar of the Book of Common Prayer, I have been struck with the extraordinary persistency with which the twenty-fifth day of the month, or a day thereabouts, has been assigned to a commemoration either of our Lord or more frequently of an eminent saint. That this is the case is evident from a glance at the following table, which accounts for twelve of the twenty-four red-letter commemorations, or immoveable holy days of the Kalendar.

January 25, Conversion of S. Paul.

February 24, S. Matthias, Apost. and Mart.

March 25, Annunciation of the B. V. Mary.

April 25, S. Mark, Evang. and Mart.

June 24, Nativity of S. John Bapt.

July 25, S. James, Apost. and Mart.

August 24, S. Bartholomew, Apost. and Mart.

September 21, S. Matthew, Ap. Ev. and Mart.
October 28, SS. Simon and Jude, AA. and MM.
December 25, Nativity of our Lord.
„ 26, S. Stephen, D. and Mart.
„ 27, S. John, Apost. and Evang.

The persistence of the choice of the twenty-fifth day of the month, or a day quite near it, is sufficiently remarkable to provoke enquiry. Such enquiry I have made from other students of the Kalendar, but without result. One explanation has suggested itself to me, but I have not been able to verify it with any success. It is as follows,—It was commonly held that the Annunciation to the B. V. Mary and the Nativity of our Lord happened, precisely to the day, nine months apart, and that each event occurred on the twenty-fifth day of the month. From the Gospel narrative¹ we know that St. John the Baptist was six months older than our Lord ; this gives, accurately speaking, the twenty-fifth day of the month as his birthday also.² From the importance of the twenty-fifth

¹ St. Luke i. 26.

² “It is to be noted that the festival of the Nativity of St. John Baptist is on the 24th, and not on the 25th of June ; and we may well ask why the latter figure was not adopted,

day of the month, suggested by the commemorations of the Conception and the Nativity of our Lord, and the nativity of His forerunner, may possibly be due the desire to keep up a monthly observance of that particular date, the influence of which is seen in the oft-recurring choice of the twenty-fifth day for the anniversary of great saints. Whether or not this gives the true explanation, I am unable to say with any degree of certainty. Nevertheless, as has been observed above, the persistence of a great holy day on or about the twenty-fifth of the month has a certain amount of significance, whatever that significance may be.

The fact to which allusion is made certainly seems to show decisively that the choice of date for commemorating the leading saints of the Kalendar cannot be held to refer to the actual date of their deaths. It is inconceivable

since it would have given the exact interval of six months between the Baptist and Christ. The reason is that the calculation was made according to the Roman Kalendar ; the 24th of June is the *viii. kal. jul.*, just as the 25th of December is *viii. kal. jan.* At Antioch, where the calculation was made, from the beginning to the end of the month the 25th would undoubtedly have been chosen."—Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, viii., § 5, 3, p. 271 note.

that this event should have happened with such frequency and regularity as to date as that referred to in regard to the particular day of the various months specified in the Kalendar. In fact there is only one apostle whose commemoration is considered definitely to be placed on the day of his death, namely, St. Andrew.

And this leads naturally to the enquiry, What was the determining fact connected with the saints which led to their commemoration on the days so universally adopted by the Church, or at least so generally adopted in East and West respectively? Broadly speaking, the answer to this interesting enquiry is, that with the exception of certain martyrs, to which reference will be made later, the various dates assigned to the commemorations of saints appear to have been determined with special reference to their burial, or the removal later of their bodies or relics to churches specially built to receive and preserve them, and the dedication of such churches in their memory.

The earliest examples known of the observance of saints' days are those of the martyrs.

The anniversary of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp (c. A.D. 155) was instituted at Smyrna immediately after his death.

"The centurion, therefore, seeing the contention of the Jews, put his body into the midst of the fire, and so consumed it. After which, we, taking up his bones, more precious than the richest jewels, and tried above gold, deposited them where it was fitting; where, being gathered together as we have opportunity, with joy and gladness, the Lord shall grant unto us to celebrate the anniversary of his martyrdom, both in memory of those who have suffered, and for the exercise and preparation of those that may hereafter suffer." ¹

This commemoration of St. Polycarp appears to be the most ancient at present known; ² it is to be observed that it was closely connected with the preservation of his relics—the celebration of his anniversary was made at the place where his bones were deposited. From the beginning of the third century the celebration of such anniversaries became a matter of universal observance, ³ and it is fairly

¹ *Relation of the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp*, xviii.

² Duchesne, *Origines*, viii., § 5, 8, p. 283.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 284.

certain that they give the origin of certain of the commemorations of the early Martyrologies. St. Cyprian observes that the death-days of the martyrs were to be carefully noted, in order that such commemorations might be kept with the celebration of the Eucharist.¹ In the 18th of the Edessene Canons, which date from about the middle of the fourth century, it is said—

“Whenever any shall depart out of this world with a good testimony to the faith of Christ, and with affliction borne for His name’s sake, make ye a commemoration of them on the day on which they were put to death.”²

In this commemoration of the martyrs we find the primitive precedent for the observance of Saints’ days, though it does not help us much in regard to other commemorations. The grouping of St. Stephen, St. John, and the Holy Innocents, round the festival of the Nativity is obviously symbolical and not historical. Whilst the commemoration of St.

¹ Ep. xii., to the presbyters and deacons of the Church of Carthage.

² *Syriac Documents concerning Edessa*, in the Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. XX., p. 42.

James on July 25 cannot be the date of his martyrdom, which took place earlier in the year, at the time of the Passover.¹

But connected with such observance, and as a motive additional to the marking of the dates of martyrdom, the removal of the martyrs' relics to shrines and basilicas specially erected to contain and preserve them, and the dedication of such basilicas, had very considerable influence in fixing the dates of their anniversaries. The day of the month upon which such translations of relics or dedications of churches took place became marked year by year. We have a very definite instance of this process in the case of the festivals of May 3 and September 14, named in our Kalendar, "The Invention of the Cross" and "Holy Cross day" respectively. These festivals were originated at Jerusalem by Constantine the Great in commemoration of the dedication in A.D. 335 of a church built upon Golgotha to receive the supposed relic of the cross, said to have been discovered by his mother, St. Helena, and the

¹ Acts xii. 1, 2, 3.

restoration of the same to Jerusalem, after it had been removed by Heraclius, two centuries later. The two festivals of the Cross are the anniversaries of these two events. I am of opinion that the Western observance of the feast of the Epiphany, in commemoration of the Visit of the Wise Men to our Lord, may ultimately be traced to the translation of the relics of the Magi by Eustorgius during the first quarter of the fourth century. Eustorgius was sent by Constantine before the year A.D. 315, as his legate to Milan, and he so greatly pleased the Milanese, that on a vacancy of the see he was elected bishop by popular acclamation. At this time the bodies of the Magi had been discovered, or said to be discovered, in the East, and they were sent to Constantinople where they were preserved in the basilica of St. Sophia. Eustorgius, at his consecration in A.D. 315, begged these relics from Constantine, and they were removed with very great circumstance to a church prepared for them, now known as S. Estorgio and the oldest church in Milan, where they rested until they were translated to Cologne in the twelfth century.

I think it highly probable that this translation of relics was the origin of—or, at least gave a great impetus to—the Western observance of January 6 in commemoration of the Magi. Anyhow, it is from about the date of their translation from Constantinople to Milan A.D. 316, that we find that the more ancient commemoration of the Birth and the Baptism of our Lord on the feast of the Epiphany gradually began to be superseded in the West by that of the Eastern Magi.¹

Following Duchesne,² we come to the conclusion that, broadly speaking, the commemoration of Apostles, Martyrs, and Confessors in the Kalendar, the majority of which were introduced later than the fourth century, are due to the local dedication of churches named after the various saints; and this dedication was almost if not always accompanied by the translation or deposition of relics of the saints thus honoured.

So much was this the case, that a necessary

¹ See "The Origin of the Festival of the Magi," in this volume, p. 29 ff.

² *Origines*, ch. viii.

preliminary to the dedication of churches was the discovery or possession of relics to be deposited therein as an essential feature of their consecration. Dr. John Wordsworth, the present Bishop of Salisbury, has pointed out that the ancient peculiar rites of consecration of churches may be described as extensions of two conceptions—(1) a formal taking over of the place in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and a dedication of it to Him with rites in a great measure parallel to those by which the living Christian is dedicated in Baptism and Confirmation; (2) a translation and burial of relics of martyrs, by which the altar became the covering of a tomb.¹ As an illustration of this requirement, we may instance the case of St. Ambrose about the year A.D. 386–7. He was requested to consecrate a new basilica at Milan. “To do this,” he said, “I must find the relics of martyrs,” in order to conform to the prevailing custom of building churches over the tombs of those who had yielded their lives in testimony to the Catholic Faith, and

¹ *On the Rite of Consecration of Churches*, Ch. Hist. Soc., lii., S.P.C.K., 1899; p. 10.

of hallowing them by placing the mortal remains of some martyr or saint within the walls. In this case search had to be made, for Milan had not been fruitful in martyrs. This search resulted in the discovery of the remains of two huge men, the skeletons quite complete, surrounded by the traces of blood. The bodies were identified as being those of two Milanese, Gervasius and Prostasius, who had suffered three hundred years or thereabouts before, under Nero or Domitian. The burial-place of these men had been forgotten, until the discovery of the bodies brought it to the remembrance of some old people, who recollected having heard their names and read the inscription on their tomb. These relics were sufficient to supply the need of St. Ambrose; and they were translated to the new church, thereupon consecrated by him under his name,¹ S. Ambrogio. Such is the account given by St. Ambrose in a letter to Marcellina, his sister.²

¹ The modernised crypt contains the tombs of SS. Ambrose, Gervasius and Prostasius.

² *St. Ambrose, his life and times*, by R. Thornton, D.D., S.P.C.K., 1879; pp. 61, 62.

The discovery by St. Helena of the cross, together with that by St. Ambrose of the supposed remains of SS. Gervasius and Prostatius, caused great enthusiasm in relic hunting, and gave considerable impetus to the practice of which we are speaking.

"It became usual," says the bishop of Salisbury, "to have relics in all churches, if not actual fragments of bodies, yet something which had touched or been connected with a saint. It might be a scrap of a garment or of a covering of his tomb, a handkerchief bathed in blood, or a phial of oil from the lamp of his sanctuary. With this all the formalities of a burial service were gone through, just as if it had been a body."¹

So strong was this demand for relics of saints in order to the consecration and dedication of churches, that, where relics were not to be had for the purpose, the Consecrated Elements of the Eucharist were so used, and sometimes fragments of the Gospels.²

There are a certain number of commemorations in the Kalendar which can be definitely

¹ *Rite of Consecration of Churches*, p. 20.

² *Ibid.*, p. 21.

traced as to their origin of observance to the translation and deposition of relics of the saints in whose names churches were dedicated. These commemorations are practically in the germ nothing else but dedication festivals, kept annually hereafter on the day of the actual consecration of the churches. There are amongst the black-letter holy days of the Anglican Kalendar several such instances, for example—May 3, Invention of the Cross; June 20, Translation of Edward, K. ; July 4, Translation of Martin, B.C. ; July 15, Translation of Swithun, B. ; September 14, Holy Cross day ; October 13, Translation of K. Edward, C. ;—all of these are simply the anniversaries of the removal of relics to shrines prepared for them, and the dedication or re-dedication of churches in the names of those whose relics or supposed relics they were.

I have mentioned these black-letter commemorations, because their very designations tell the story of their origination. But the evidence is stronger still in the case of certain of the red-letter commemorations of the Kalendar. To these I am about to direct the reader's

attention ; but, before so doing, it will be well to speak of certain black-letter commemorations of the Anglican Kalendar not alluded to above. Dr. Sanday, in his tract entitled *Minor Holy Days of the Church of England*,¹ gives the following black-letter days as originating merely in dedications of churches—May 6, St. John, ante Portam Latinam, the date originally marking the dedication of a church at Rome ;² June 1, Nicomede, the date of the dedication of the church of S. Nichomedes at Rome ; August 1, Lammas day, the feast of St. Peter *ad Vincula*, celebrating the dedication of the church of the Apostles at Rome, where the supposed chains with which St. Peter was bound in prison were preserved ;³ October 17, Etheldreda, whose body was translated on this date by her sister Sexburga, sixteen years after her death ; November 25, Catherine, whose popularity in France and England dates from the translation of her supposed relics to Rouen before A.D. 1035 ; December 6, Nicholas, to

¹ No publisher's name, or date ; and out of print.

² Duchesne, *Origines*, viii. § 5, 7, p. 281.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 280.

whose honour the Emperor Justinian built a church at Constantinople. All these are dedication festivals.

But to return to the red-letter commemorations of the Kalendar and their connection in origin and subsequent observance in regard to dedication feasts. Before dealing with saints' days proper, it will be well to adduce the example of the commemoration of St. Michael and All Angels. The addition of "All Angels" is purely Anglican, and modern, dating from the last revision of the Book of Common Prayer in A.D. 1661: it was borrowed from Bishop Cosin's *Collection of Private Devotions* of A.D. 1627. Previously, in all Kalendars of the Prayer Book, and in the Kalendars of the Sarum, York, and Hereford books, and in that of the Westminster Missal, the commemoration is simply, "S. Michael," or "Michaelis Archangeli." In the Roman Kalendar, the origin of the commemoration is clearly indicated, the title being, "*Dedicatio basilice sancti michaelis archangeli*";¹ "*Dedicatio S.*

¹ *Missale Romanum, Mediolani*, 1474, H. Bradshaw Soc. 1899; p. xxi.

Michaelis Archangeli."¹ Here we have a conspicuous example of a dedication feast being the origin of the annual observance of a holy day. In fact, as Duchesne observes, festivals of this kind can be attributed only to the dedications of churches.² In this instance the church with which the commemoration of St. Michael was connected was that in the suburbs of Rome at the sixth milestone on the Via Salaria.³ In the case of the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul on June 29, we have, not as might be supposed the anniversary of the martyrdom of either apostle, but merely the commemoration of the translation of their relics to the place called *ad Catacumbas*, at the third milestone on the Appian Way.⁴ The same may be said in regard to the Conversion of St. Paul, the more ancient designation of this feast being *Translatio S. Pauli Apostoli*, but it is difficult to say where the translation actually took place. The festival of May 1, in

¹ *Missale Romanum*, Venetiis, 1580 ; *sub* Sept. 29.

² *Origines*, viii. § 5, 6, p. 276.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 277.

commemoration of the apostles St. Philip and St. James, was also the anniversary of the dedication of a church, namely, of that called the Holy Apostles at Rome: this church being dedicated on May 1.¹ In the case of the commemoration of All Saints, we have a similar instance of a festival taking its origin from the dedication of a church. About A.D. 607, Pope Boniface IV. procured possession of the Pantheon at Rome, a temple dedicated to all the heathen gods, which he converted to be henceforth a Christian church under the title of "St. Mary and all Martyrs." This anniversary was at first observed on May 13; but by the time of the Ven. Bede it seems to have been transferred for some reason or other to November 1.² In the Martyrology of Bede there are found two days dedicated to All Saints, one on May 13, *Dedicatio Sanctae Mariae ad Martyres*, and the other on November 1. In the Sacramentary of St. Gregory, both days have collects etc. provided for them, that in May being designated *Natale Sanctae Mariae ad Martyres*;

¹ *Origines*, viii. § 5, 6, p. 282.

² Wordsworth, *The Ministry of Grace*, p. 420.

and that in November, *Natale Omnium Sanctorum*.¹ The word *Natale* was commonly used in the case of bishops for "Consecration," and it appears to have this meaning in regard to the church at Rome to which reference has just been made. The point to be noticed here is, that the festival of All Saints owes its origin to the dedication of a church.

In view of what has been said above about keeping the anniversaries of the deaths of martyrs, it is not a little remarkable to find that the festival of St. Andrew, November 30, which is at least as old as the fourth century, is probably the only festival of an Apostle claiming to be really kept on the anniversary of his death.² In any case, this was not the date on which his translation was observed at Constantinople, which was March 3, neither was it that of the second dedication of the church of the Holy Apostles in that city, which was July 28, nor of that of the dedication of the first church dedicated to his memory at Rome, which was November 3.³

¹ Blunt, *Annot. B. of C. Prayer*, Lond., 1885 ; pp. 341-2.

² *The Ministry of Grace*, p. 419.

³ Duchesne, *Origines*, viii. § 5, 7, p. 283.

It remains to give some explanation how certain of the commemorations of saints in the Kalendar, which as we have seen were purely local in origin, came by degrees to be observed in other places, and eventually throughout the Church in general. Festivals of the dedication of a church and of the translation of bodies and relics were often synonymous, as we have seen. These were, obviously, at first merely local anniversaries, observed in the very places where the saints had died and been buried, or where their relics were preserved. Quite naturally these anniversaries would spread in the surrounding neighbourhood, and be taken up by the chief church of the diocese. Then, the practice arose of one diocese adopting the commemorations of another, as the fame of the departed heroes of the faith was spread abroad. Some great names, such as SS. Sixtus and Laurence of Rome, and St. Cyprian of Carthage, even attained almost œcumenical veneration, finding their way by degrees into almost all Kalendars of the Church. Amongst the merely local festivals, reference must not be omitted to the anniversaries not only of the



burial or *depositio* of bishops, but also of their consecration known by the term *natale*.

Although all the red-letter commemorations of the Anglican Kalendar have not been accounted for above, yet enough has been said to indicate the lines upon which further investigations may well proceed, with some hope of ultimate success.

V

ST. ENURCHUS—A LITURGICAL PROBLEM

THE only addition which was made to the Kalendar of the Book of Common Prayer at the revision in the year 1604 was that of St. Enurchus. In the Kalendar of that revision we find opposite September 7, "Enurchus Bish." The reason which prompted the addition of but one name, and that of an obscure Gallican saint, in 1604, has been a continual source of inquiry amongst students of the Kalendar; and, so far as I am aware, no explanation of the addition has hitherto been attempted. Mr. Frere does not hesitate to say that "the one effort of 1604, which added the name of Enurchus to the Kalendar of September, is distinguished both for inaccuracy and want of judgment, since the saint intended was really named Evurtius, and at best had no claim to

be rescued from the oblivion of some Sarum Primer¹ to be set in this position.”²

I believe that I have discovered the true reason for this strange addition to the Kalendar of 1604 of which I speak. The fact that the commemoration of St. Evurtius (misprinted Enurchus) was the only addition to the Kalendar in the revision of the Book of Common Prayer under James I., and that this sole addition was not the name of a saint either of special pre-eminence or in any way connected with the English Church, implies that the aim in view was simply to attach some saint's name to September 7, regardless either of any enrichment of the Kalendar, or of the supply of any serious omission in the Kalendar current in Elizabeth's reign. In other words, the purpose of the revisers of 1604 seems to have been merely to mark the day or date, rather than to honour the memory of the saint chosen—the name selected being simply a matter of secondary consideration. This comes out very

¹ See however later in this article, p. 61.

² *A New Hist. of the B. of C. P.*, Lond., 1901; p. 340.

strongly in comparing the addition of St. Evurtius in 1604, with the two later additions of St. Alban and the Venerable Bede in 1662, both the latter names being very specially connected with the British and the English Churches respectively. In the additions of 1662, the purpose was evidently to supply two serious omissions in the Kalendar; whilst in the addition of St. Evurtius no such ground can be pleaded. Had there been any intention of enriching the Kalendar of 1604, there were many names of celebrated saints of universal reputation, and with English associations, worthy of inclusion and commemoration. The addition of but one name in 1604, and that of a saint with no claims upon the reverent memory of the English Church, irresistibly points to some clear intention to mark September 7 as a day to be noted by English Churchmen of the period for some ulterior and insular reason. What was this reason?

The solution of the problem which is suggested is as follows. In the Kalendar of the *Preces Privatae* of 1564, published in Elizabeth's reign, we find set against September 7,

"Enurchi epi".¹ Now the name "Enurchus" is, as we have said above, a misprint for "Evurtius"; and the misprint is of use in directing us to the source from which the commemoration in the Kalendar of the *Preces Privatae* of 1564 was probably taken. The compilers of this Kalendar appear to have had before them the Kalendar of the York Breviary, and the Regnault edition of 1526 in particular, in which the entry facing September 7 is printed "Eurci."² In the Kalendar of the *Preces Privatae* the first "u" for "v" has become inverted, a most common printers' error, with the result that the saint's name therein appears as "Enurchi." The perpetuation of this misprint by the revisers of 1604 affords evidence that they took the commemoration immediately from the Kalendar of the *Preces Privatae* of 1564, rather than directly from the Kalendar of the York Breviary as has been assumed. In this

¹ *Private Prayers, put forth by authority during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*; Parker Soc., p. 221.

² See Mr. F. E. Warren's article on "The Kalendar of the Book of Common Prayer," in *Hierurgia Anglicana*, Part III., p. 257 (De la More Press, 1904).

connexion it is not a little remarkable that the commemoration of St. Alban on June 17, instead of June 22, as is very general in the old Kalendar, and the commemoration of the Ven. Bede on May 27 (the only additions to the Kalendar of 1662), are alike found on these days in the Kalendar of the *Preces Privatae* of 1564. This being so, it is not inappropriate to suggest that the revisers of 1662 likewise consulted the Kalendar of 1564.¹ This suggestion affords some clue to the unusual selection of June 17 for St. Alban in 1662. The assignment of September 26 to St. Cyprian of Carthage—a most unusual day—in the Kalendar of 1662 may possibly be likewise traced, through the Kalendar of 1604 to the Kalendar of 1564—the “Cyprian” of 1604 probably being the St. Cyprian of Antioch, who together with St. Justina occurs on September 26 in the Kalendar of the *Preces Privatae* of 1564. The confusion

¹ Lord Aldenham in his article on “St. Alban’s Day,” etc., in *Transactions of St. Paul’s Eccles. Soc.*, Vol. IV., p. 33, whilst recognising this, adds: “But we may rather, and with greater probability, infer that there was some one earlier source for both errors.”

between the two Cyprians is of early growth.¹

But to pursue our inquiry as to the reason of the insertion of St. Enurchus in the Kalendar of 1604, it is necessary to go behind the Kalendar of the *Preces Privatae* of 1564, and to consult "The New Kalendar" of 1561, which was put forth with authority but three years earlier. Now this "New Kalendar" is a most important document in regard to any study of our present Kalendar of 1662. In 1561, a Commission, consisting of Archbishop Parker, Bishop Grindal, Dr. Bill, and Mr. Walter Haddon, was appointed to examine and amend the then existing Kalendar of the Prayer Book of 1559. As a result of the Commissioners' deliberations, nearly all² the black-letter holy days [with the exception of St. Enurchus (1604), and the Ven. Bede and St. Alban (1662)] found in our present Kalendar were added. In "The New

¹ See Dr. J. Wickham Legg's article, "Notes on the Day assigned to St. Cyprian of Carthage," etc., in *Transactions of St. Paul's Eccles. Soc.*, Vol. IV., pp. 47, *seq.*

² The Kalendar of 1559 had S. George, Lammass, S. Laurence, and S. Clement.

Kalendar" of 1561, September 7 is blank—St. Enurchus not appearing, as we have seen, till 1564 in the Kalendar of the *Preces Privatae* of that year. But in the later edition of "The New Kalendar," which appeared in 1578, we find inserted opposite September 7, "Nati. of Elizabeth;" whilst in the footnotes we read, "September 7, our Soueraigne Lady Queene Elizabeth, was borne as vpon this day, at Greenewich, *Anno* 1532."¹

We have here the probable explanation of the addition of the commemoration of St. Enurchus on September 7, to the Kalendar of the Prayer Book of 1604. That day was, no doubt, kept as a holiday all through Queen Elizabeth's reign, and it seems very likely that on her death and the accession of James I. in 1603, the people, having been accustomed for more than a generation to keep holiday on the Queen's birthday, were unwilling to treat September 7 as an ordinary working day.² On this supposition we may

¹ *The New Kalendar*, 1561, in *Liturgical Services of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*; Parker Soc., p. 452.

² Observe that the memory of the birthday of George III. is still kept at Eton on June 4.

hold it probable that the authorities, in order to please the people, and to keep alive the memory of Queen Elizabeth, consulted the Kalendar of the *Preces Privatæ* of 1564, which had her authority, and found ready to hand a former commemoration, namely, "Enurchi epi.," which translated "Enurchus Bish.," they transferred to the Kalendar of the Book of Common Prayer at its revision on the accession of James I. The precise translation of "Enurchus Bish." for "Enurchi epi." affords further evidence in favour of this view. This addition of September 7 as a minor holy day would thus give the reason or excuse for continuing, in the reign of James I., the public observance of the holiday as in former times.

If the conclusion arrived at in the foregoing remarks be legitimate, as appears to be the case, it affords an interesting piece of evidence, however indirect, that the black-letter holy days of the Kalendar were, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, regarded as possessing more or less the character of holidays, or at least that they were not considered as ordinary working days.

VI

THE COMMEMORATION OF KING CHARLES THE MARTYR

IN all editions of the Book of Common Prayer from A.D. 1662 to A.D. 1859, opposite January 30 in the Kalendar stands the entry, *K. Charles Martyr.*

In editions which have been printed since the latter date, this commemoration is omitted. And this omission is more remarkable, when we find that in both The Book Annexed, the original MS. copy of the Book of Common Prayer, and also in The Sealed Books, the commemoration *K. Charles Mart.* is written or printed in red ink, in similar style to other red-letter commemorations of the Kalendar. The Book Annexed and the Sealed Books are the version of the Book of Common Prayer imposed upon the English Church as Statute

Law by the combined authority of Church and Realm ; that is to say, by the joint authority of Convocation, Parliament, and Sovereign. In the Act of Uniformity, *xiv. Carol. II.*, which authorised the revised Prayer Book of 1662, in which for the first time the commemoration of King Charles the Martyr on January 30 appeared, occur the words, following the quotation of the title-page of that Book—"All which His Majesty having duly considered hath fully approved and allowed the same, and recommended to this present Parliament, that the said Book of Common Prayer, and of the Form of Ordination and Consecration of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, with the Alterations and Additions, which have been so made and presented to His Majesty by the said Convocations [of the Provinces of Canterbury and York], be the Book, which shall be appointed to be used by all that Officiate in all Cathedral and Collegiate Churches and Chappels, and in all Chappels of Colledges and Halls in both the Universities, and the Colledges of Eaton and Winchester, and in all Parish-Churches and Chappels within the Kingdom of England.

As the Kalendar formed part of the Book thus imposed as Statute Law by Convocation, Parliament and the King, the observation of all the red-letter commemorations of the Kalendar is legally binding upon the clergy. Among such red-letter commemorations, *King Charles the Martyr* on January 30, as we have said, is included; and the omission of this commemoration from the Kalendar since A.D. 1859 has been made without the authority of either Convocation, Parliament, or Sovereign, acting either independently of each other or in lawful combination. How then has this commemoration of January 30 been removed? It has been removed solely by the will of the printers of modern times, and without authority of any kind whatsoever. According to the Act of Uniformity of Charles II., to which reference has been made, the commemoration of *King Charles the Martyr* stands, as far as the Kalendar is concerned, on precisely the same footing as the other red-letter days of January—The Circumcision, The Epiphany, The Conversion of St. Paul: and from this point of view, its observation is equally binding as that

of the other three red-letter commemorations named. It is surely a monstrous thing that the printers since 1859 should have been allowed, unchecked by the authorities, to perpetuate this violent infringement of the terms of the Act of Uniformity of 1662. And certainly copies of the Book of Common Prayer so mutilated do not represent the Book Annexed, or the Sealed Books, which contain the commemoration of January 30, and which form the legal standard of the Prayer Book. It is, moreover, inexplicable that the University Presses, in their recent reprints of the Prayer Book, should have omitted the commemoration of *King Charles the Martyr* from the Kalendar, whilst they have corrected the misspelling of "Enurchus," Sept. 7, to "Evurtius"; and corrected "hand" to "hands," in the seventh verse of the *Benedictus*; and added the previously omitted "the" before "dead," in the Collect for Advent Sunday; and deleted "well" before "pleased," in the fifteenth Offertory Sentence; the last three corrections being made to bring the Book into conformity with the Book Annexed, as the legal standard. The

plea that the State Service for January 30 having been cancelled by Royal authority, of which proceeding I shall speak later, the red-letter commemoration of *King Charles the Martyr* is likewise cancelled, cannot be urged; because, in the Book Annexed, whilst January 30 is marked in the Kalendar, as we have said, no State Service for that day is provided. Granting, for the sake of argument, that the Service for the day has been lawfully removed from the later editions of the Prayer Book, the commemoration of *King Charles the Martyr* in the Kalendar stands to-day on precisely the same authoritative footing as it did in 1662—the commemoration appeared, whilst no special liturgical features for its observation were provided in the Prayer Book. We are therefore constrained to enter our protest against the illegality on the part of the printers, in arbitrarily tampering with a portion of the Prayer Book as originally imposed by the joint authority of this Church and Realm.

The Book Annexed was signed by the members of the Houses of Convocation on December 20, 1661; and, whilst the State

Service for January 30 was not included, nevertheless, after the Form of Consecrating an Archbishop or Bishop, stands the note:—
"The Forms of Prayer for ye v. of November, ye xxx. of Januarie, and for ye xxix. of May, are to be printed at ye End of this Book." This note also appears in the Sealed Books.¹ This statement may possibly be held to qualify what has been said above, as to the entry in the Kalendar standing apart from any liturgical provision for its observance. At any rate that provision was prospective and not actual. The Book of Common Prayer was published before St. Bartholomew's Day, Aug. 24, 1662, and came into legal use on that day. Meanwhile, Convocation had been entrusted with the task of compiling the State Services named above. On April 26, 1661, the Service for January 30, together with those for November 5 and May 29, were introduced and publicly read through in Convocation, and approved by unanimous consent.² Now though these State Services

¹ See Stephens, *The B. of C. P.*, Eccles. Hist. Soc., iii. 2139.

² Die Sabbati 26. Aprilis, inter horas 8. et 10. ante merid' ejusd' diei, etc., formae precum pro 5. Novembris, 30. Januarii, et 29. Maii, fuerunt introductae et publice perlectae, et unanimi

were provided for by anticipation in the Book Annexed, as we have said, they were not in the Book which was submitted to Parliament, and they were not confirmed by the civil authority: they were annexed later to that Book by royal authority.¹ But nevertheless they were *sanctioned*, though not authoritatively *imposed* for use, by Convocation. The authority for the religious observance of January 30, was *Statute 12 Charles II. c. 30*, confirmed by *Statute 13 Charles II. i.c. 7*. But in neither of these statutes was any direction given as to the service to be appointed for the day, that appointment being left to the King in Council under his royal supremacy.² The State Service for January 30, with the two other services, were accordingly considered and arranged, under the King's license for that purpose, in the Convocation of 1662, as we have seen; and when the Book of Common Prayer was published according to the Act of Uniformity,

consensu approbatae.—*Acts and Proceedings in Convocation*, 1661. *Sessio LXXX*. Cardwell, *Synodalia*, ii. 671.

¹ Lathbury, *History of Convocation*, Lond. 1853; p. 304.

² Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, Oxford, 1840; p. 383 note.

they were annexed to it in accordance with the following order :—

Charles R. Our will and pleasure is that these three forms of prayer and service made for the 5th of November, the 30th of January, and the 29th of May, be forthwith printed and published, and for the future annexed to the Book of Common Prayer and Liturgy of the Church of England, to be used yearly on the said days in all cathedral and collegiate churches and chapels, in all chapels of colleges and halls within both our universities, and of our colleges of Eton and Winchester, and in all parish churches and chapels within our kingdom of England, dominion of Wales and town of Berwick upon Tweed. Given at our Court of Whitehall the 2nd day of May in the 14th year of our reign. By his Majesty's command, Edward Nicholas." ¹

A like order has been issued by the sovereign at the commencement of each successive reign. Such an order was issued by Queen Victoria in the first year of her reign, dated "our Court at Kensington, June 21, 1837." Certain changes have from time to time been made in these State Services by royal authority; as in the reign of James II., and in that of William

¹ Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, Oxford, 1840; p. 383 note.

and Mary; but in neither of these cases, apparently, was Convocation consulted.

On January 17, 1859, Queen Victoria issued an order cancelling the previous order made on her accession to the throne for the continuance of the use of the State Services. The Services were discontinued in consequence of addresses presented to the Crown from both Houses of Parliament; and a Statute was passed repealing the previous Acts of Parliament which enjoined the religious observance of November 5, January 30, and May 29. This Statute was 22 *Vict. c. 2*. In Queen Victoria's order just referred to, after calling attention to her previous order for the continuance of the State Services made on her accession, occur the words—"And whereas, in the last Session of Parliament, Addresses were presented to Us by both Houses of Parliament, praying Us to take into Our Consideration Our Proclamation in relation to the said Forms of Prayer and Service made for the Fifth Day of November, the Thirtieth Day of January, and the Twenty-ninth Day of May, with a view to their Discontinuance. . . . We have resolved that the

Use of the said Forms of Prayer and Service shall be discontinued. Now, therefore, Our Will and Pleasure is, that so much of Our said Royal Warrant of the Twenty-first day of June, 1837, in the First Year of Our Reign, be revoked, and that the Use of the said Forms of Prayer and Service made for the Fifth of November, the Thirtieth of January, and the Twenty-ninth of May be henceforth discontinued . . . and that the said Forms of Prayer and Service be not henceforth printed and published with or annexed to the Book of Common Prayer and Liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland.”¹

It will thus be seen that the omission of the State Services from the Book of Common Prayer has been effected since 1859, by Royal and Parliamentary authority, without consent of the Church as represented in Convocation. And, what is more serious, this partial authority of the Crown and State has cancelled an order of the Book Annexed, which directs

¹ Queen Victoria's Orders of 1837 and 1859 are printed in Campion and Beamont, *The Prayer Book Interleaved*, 7th ed., p. 358.

that "The Forms of Prayer for the fifth of November, the thirtieth of January, and for the twenty-ninth of May, are to be printed at the End of this Book." Now this direction is part of the Statute Law of England, authorised by Convocation, Parliament and the Sovereign ; and therefore the action of the Queen and Parliament in 1859 constitutes a distinct violation of the compact between Church and Realm, as set forth in the Act of Uniformity which imposed the Book of Common Prayer in 1662, to which reference has been made above.

Before ordination, candidates for Holy Orders are required to take oath—"I will use the Form in the said Book (of Common Prayer) prescribed, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority ;" and the only authority lawfully and constitutionally exercised in regard to the Services of the Church is the combined authority of Church and State. The clergy cannot legally be required to acquiesce in the omission of any Service recognised in the rubrics or directions of the Book of Common Prayer ; and as the

direction to print the State Services at the end of that Book is found in the original copy of the Book which was issued by Convocation, Parliament and the Crown; and as Convocation was not consulted in the cancelling of the State Services in 1859, the order of the Queen and Parliament made in that year for their discontinuance is clearly *ultra vires*. No Court, giving judgment impartially, could possibly condemn any clergyman who might think it right to use on January 30, the Service referred to in the last rubric or direction of the Book Annexed of 1662.

It is also to be observed that, even if the actual form of Service for the Martyrdom of King Charles I. was imposed by Royal authority alone, nevertheless that form was drawn up and unanimously approved by Convocation in 1662: it had the sanction of Convocation. And to make the action of the Queen and the Parliament in 1859, in cancelling the form for January 30, valid, it is necessary to show that Convocation assented to the discontinuance of that form of Service. No evidence of Convocation being consulted as to the discontinuance

of the Service is so far forthcoming. I have the authority of an old and prominent member of the Southern Convocation for saying—"my impression is, that the Service for January 30 was withdrawn by the independent action of the Crown: if so, the question will arise whether the Crown had the right to this action apart from the acquiescence of Convocation." To this question there can be but one answer, and that is in an emphatic "No." If it can be shown from a search into the Chronicles of Convocation that in 1859, that body acquiesced formally in the discontinuance of the Service for King Charles' Martyrdom, then there is nothing further to be said, as far as the use of that Service is concerned. But even then, the entry "*January 30, King Charles Mart.*" remains in the Kalendar as a legally authorised red-letter day of the English Church, the entry never having been deleted either by Church or State. As to how the commemoration of January 30 is to be observed, I do not presume to venture an opinion; but one thing is certain, namely, that some observance is in consistency implied by the fact that the *Martyrdom of*

King Charles the First finds a place as a red-letter day in the Kalendar of the Book of Common Prayer. It may, however, be not amiss to specify some of the liturgical features of the Service for January 30, for the benefit of those who may not have ready access to the original document :—

At Morning Prayer.—*Proper Psalms*, vii., ix., x., xi.

Proper Lessons, 2 Samuel i. St. Matthew, xxvii.

Collect : “ O Most Mighty God, terrible in Thy judgments, and wonderful in Thy doings towards the children of men, Who in Thy heavy displeasure didst suffer the life of our late gracious Sovereign to be this day taken away by wicked hands ; We, Thy unworthy servants, humbly confess, that the sins of this Nation have been the cause which hath brought this heavy judgment upon us. But, O gracious God, when Thou makest inquisition for blood, lay not the guilt of this innocent blood, (the shedding whereof nothing but the blood of Thy Son can expiate) lay it not to the charge of the people of this Land, nor let it ever be required of us, or our posterity. Be merciful, be merciful unto Thy people, whom Thou hast redeemed ; and be not angry with us for ever ; but pardon us for Thy mercies’ sake, through the merits of Thy SON our LORD JESUS CHRIST. *Amen.* ”

In the Communion Service, after the Prayer for the King:

Blessed Lord, in whose sight the death of thy saints is precious ; We magnify thy Name for that abundant grace bestowed on our late Martyred Sovereign ; by which he was enabled so cheerfully to follow the steps of his blessed Master and Saviour, in a constant meek bearing of all barbarous indignities, and at last resisting unto blood ; and even then, according to the same pattern, praying for his murderers. Let his memory, O Lord, be ever blessed among us, that we may follow the example of his patience, and charity : And grant, that this our Land may be freed from the vengeance of his blood, and Thy mercy glorified in the forgiveness of our sins ; and all for JESUS CHRIST His sake. *Amen.*

The Epistle, 1 St. Peter ii., 13-23.

The Gospel, St. Matthew xxi., 33-42.

At Evening Prayer.—Proper Psalms, xxxviii., lxiv., cxliii.

Proper Lessons, Jeremiah xli., or Daniel ix. to 22. Hebrews xi., 32 to xii., 7.

Mr. Lathbury¹ remarks, that it is not generally known that two Forms of Service for the Martyrdom of King Charles were issued previously to that appended to the Prayer

¹ *History of the Book of Common Prayer*, 1859 ; p. 334.

Book of 1662, one in 1661 and the other in January, 1662. In the first of these appeared a very remarkable prayer containing a petition in reference to the Martyrs. This prayer was cancelled later, and a second form substituted in 1662. The prayer referred to is as follows :—

But here, O Lord, we offer unto Thee all possible praise and thanks for all the glory of Thy grace that shined forth in Thine anointed, our late Sovereign, and that Thou wert pleased to own him (~~this day especially~~) in the midst of his enemies and in the hour of death, and to endue him with such eminent patience, meekness, humility, charity, and all other Christian virtues, according to the example of Thine own Son, suffering the fury of his and Thine enemies, for the preservation of Thy Church and people. And we beseech Thee to give us all grace to remember and provide for our latter end, by a careful, studious imitation of this Thy blessed Saint and Martyr, and all other Thy Saints and Martyrs that have gone before us, that we may be made worthy to receive benefit by their prayers, which they in communion with Thy Church Catholick offer up unto Thee for that part of it here militant, and yet in fight with and danger from the flesh : that following the blessed steps of their holy lives and deaths, we may also show forth the light of a good example ; for the glory of Thy Name, the conversion of our enemies,

G

and the improvement of those generations we shall shortly leave behind us: and then, with all those who have borne the heat and burthen of the day (Thy servant particularly, whose sufferings and labours we [this day commemorate), receive the reward of our labours, the harvest of our hopes, even the salvation of our souls: and that for the merits and through the mediation of Thy Son, our Blessed SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. Amen.¹

It is outside the scope of this article to discuss the history of the various editions of the State service for January 30, and their variations: reference for information upon this matter may be made to the following authorities:—

Lathbury's *History of Convocation*, pp. 305 ff.; 314; and *History of the Prayer Book*, p. 334. Cardwell's *Synodalia*, ii., 671; and *History of Conferences*, p. 383, note. J. H. Blunt's *Annot. Book of Common Prayer*, Lond., 1885, pp. 703 ff. Procter and Frere's *New Hist. of Book of Common Prayer*, Lond., 1901, pp. 645 ff.

It is sufficient to say, in conclusion, that,

¹ *Form of Common Prayer, to be used on the Thirtieth Day of January*, quoted in *Hierurgia Anglicana*, ed. V. Staley, Delamore Press, 1904; Part III. pp. 149, 150.

humanly speaking, the very existence of the Church of England as an integral part of the Catholic Church, is due to King Charles I. It is true of him that "he that will save others, himself he cannot save." By consenting to regard Episcopacy as merely a useful institution, and not an institution essential to the Church's very being, and by suffering the Presbyterian theory of the Church's ministry to be established in the land, King Charles the Martyr might have saved his life. Had King Charles yielded upon this point, the Church would have been destroyed. To forget the Royal Martyr on the day of his supreme sacrifice, is to be guilty of utter ingratitude.

True son of our dear Mother, early taught
With her to worship, and for her to die,
Nurs'd in her aisles to more than kingly thought,
Oft in her solemn hours we dream thee nigh.

And yearly now, before the Martyrs' King,
For thee she offers her maternal tears,
Calls us, like thee, to His dear feet to cling,
And bury in His wounds our earthly fears.¹

¹ John Keble, *The Christian Year*, poem on "King Charles the Martyr."

VII

THE OCCURRENCE OF FESTIVALS AND HOLY DAYS

IN the First Series of Notes upon the Book of Common Prayer, commonly attributed to Bishop Cosin, but most probably the work of one Hayward, nephew of Bishop of Overall, it is said :—"It is to be noted that the Book [of Common Prayer] does not everywhere enjoin and prescribe every little order, what should be said or done, but takes it for granted that people are acquainted with such common, and things always used already . . . and let ancient custom prevail, the thing which our Church chiefly intended in the review of this service." ¹ These words are eminently sane, and they are applicable to not a few liturgical perplexities which vex the minds of those who use the

¹ Cosin's *Works*, V. 65. Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.

Book of Common Prayer day by day and year by year. Of one of these perplexities, and a considerable and oft-recurring one, we are about to treat—namely, What is to be done as regards special observance when two festivals or holy days fall upon the same day? For example, in the year 1906 the Fourth Sunday in Lent fell upon the feast of the Annunciation, whilst the Second Sunday and the Twentieth Sunday after Trinity coincided with St. John Baptist and St. Simon and St. Jude. In 1910 Good Friday will fall upon the Annunciation, an occurrence sufficiently remarkable. In 1913 there will be seven Sundays which will occur with holy days. In fact, not a year passes without two or more occurrences of movable Sundays or holy days with immovable or fixed holy days. The perennial correspondence which appears in the Church papers on such occasions is evidence of the need of some definite guidance in the matter. When a Sunday and a holy day, or when two holy days coincide, the question arises—How are the clergy to proceed in regard to the special liturgical features—Collect, Epistle, Gospel, Lessons, Office

Hymn, and the liturgical colour? Are the two commemorations to be combined and the liturgical features to be mingled? If not, which of the commemorations is to take precedence? What is to be done concerning the day thus superseded? Is the latter to be completely ignored? These are questions which the clergy have constantly to face, and to answer in practice. The difficulty is by no means new. At the time of the last revision, in 1661, Bishop Cosin expressed a wish for a rule to be made. He wrote:—

“Before the Collects at Morning and Evening Prayer it is appointed that the first Collect shall be that of the day, which is appointed at the Communion, and the Collect for Peace to be always the second. But when a feast-day falls upon a Sunday, it is not said here which of the Collects appointed for either of those days shall be read; or whether they may both be read one after the other. Somewhat, therefore, is wanting to settle an uniformity herein.”¹

But nothing came of this good suggestion. Again, in the year 1720, Charles Wheatly published the third edition of his *Rational*

¹ Cosin's *Works*, V. 508.

Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer,¹ in which edition first appeared the following words:—"In relation to the *Concurrence* of two Holy-Days together, we have no directions either in the Rubrick, or elsewhere, which must give place, or which of the two Services must be used." Now, it is not to be overlooked that, since the year 1871, a direction has existed in the Prayer Book which affects the question of the coincidence of Sundays with holy days. But this direction is so partial and limited that it sheds but little light on the difficulty before us. Under the head, "The Order how the rest of Holy Scripture is appointed to be read," we find in the eighth paragraph, which was inserted with others in 1871, when the Lectionary was revised, the following direction:—

"If any of the holy days for which Proper Lessons are appointed in the table fall upon a Sunday which is the first Sunday in Advent, Easter Day, Whitsunday, or Trinity Sunday, the Lessons appointed for such Sunday shall be read, but if it fall upon any other Sunday, the Lessons appointed either for the

¹ Lond., 1720, folio, p. 195.

Sunday or for the holy day may be read at the discretion of the minister."

This paragraph directs that four Sundays—Advent Sunday, Easter day, Whitsunday, and Trinity Sunday—are, as far as the Lessons are concerned, and not beyond that, to take precedence over any holy days coinciding therewith. The only holy day that can possibly occur with Advent Sunday is St. Andrew. Easter day can only fall between March 22nd and April 25th inclusive, and thus affect the Annunciation only ; Whitsunday and Trinity Sunday can only occur with St. Barnabas. Thus, so far as any definite rule is concerned, the paragraph only controls three immovable holy days ; and even in these cases there is no direction whatever as to the use of Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, which form the most significant features of every red-letter commemoration in the Kalendar. The latter part of the paragraph leaves the choice of lessons on other occurrences of Sundays with holy days to "the discretion of the minister"—a not very satisfactory permission in an age when liturgical knowledge

is limited. Moreover, the authorities who drew it up did not seem to have realised, as will be seen later in detail, that when certain Sundays for which no Second Lessons are appointed occur with holy days for which Second Lessons are appointed, the former must of necessity borrow their Second Lessons from the latter. In these cases the minister, as a matter of fact, has no "discretion" in the matter—he must either read the Second Lessons for the holy day or none at all. It is said that on a certain occasion a clergyman, bent on giving a certain Sunday precedence over a holy day with which it occurred, declared from the reading-desk, "There is no Second Lesson appointed for this day's services."¹ It will be observed, too, that the paragraph under consideration gives no direction as to how the minister is to proceed when neither of the occurring days is a Sunday. Thus, in 1905, Tuesday in Easter week fell on St. Mark, April 25th; in 1909, Ash Wednesday will fall on St. Matthias, February 24th; and, as we have said, in 1910, Good Friday will occur

¹ *British Magazine*, 1837, xi. 527.

with Lady day; Ascension day and St. Philip and St. James are a possible occurrence; and also Monday and Tuesday in Easter week and Whitsun week may occur with St. Mark and St. Barnabas respectively. From this it will readily be seen that the very meagre guidance which the Prayer Book gives concerning the subject before us is both most inadequate and unsatisfactory; whilst in no case whatever does it help us in determining the choice of the chief liturgical items—Collect, Epistle, and Gospel.

In the year 1842, before the direction we have been considering was issued, Bishop Blomfield delivered a Charge, in the course of which he advised that¹;—"Where a saint's day falls on a Sunday, the Collect for the saint's day as well as that for the Sunday, should be read, and the Epistle and Gospel for the saint's day, but the Lessons for the Sunday." Bishop Blomfield does not appear to have realised what has been said above concerning the omission of Second Lessons on certain Sundays. But, to let that pass, it

¹ p. 65.

is hardly open to dispute that the course which he recommended—combining and mingling the special liturgical features of Sundays and holy days, or two occurring holy days—is most confusing and undesirable: so much so, that it seems unnecessary to discuss the subject further than to ask, What would be the result on February 24th, 1909, and on March 25th, 1910 (when Ash Wednesday will occur with St. Matthias, and Good Friday with the Annunciation, respectively), of mixing up the several readings of Holy Scripture at the various services? Surely, it would prove unsatisfactory and unedifying in the extreme. The worshippers would be confused and distracted by such a procedure.

There cannot be a doubt that the old pre-Reformation plan of observing the greater of the two commemorations on a given occasion, and transferring the observance of the less important to the next ensuing vacant day, is the true solution of the perplexity. By such an arrangement neither commemoration suffers eclipse, and all confusion is avoided. But unfortunately, at present, we have no authority

for such transference ; though it does not seem to lie outside or beyond the *jus liturgicum* of the Bishop to permit such a satisfactory solution of the difficulty experienced. And such a suggestion is by no means new, for as early as the year 1720 Charles Wheatly wrote concerning such occurrences¹:—"I take this to be a case in which the bishops ought to be consulted, they having a power vested in them to appease all diversity (if any arise) and to resolve all doubts concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute the things contained in the Book of Common Prayer. (See the Preface concerning the Services of the Church.)"

Some evidence of importance can be produced from the seventeenth century to show that certain holy days were then held to be of greater moment than the Sundays with which they coincided, and that the Sunday gave way to the holy day. The Puritans of James I.'s day complained that "Apocryphal chapters are rather read than Scripture, when any holy

¹ *A Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer*, 1720 ; p. 196.

day falls on a Sunday.”¹ Heylyn, writing in the middle of the seventeenth century, stated that the offices for the Conversion of St. Paul and for St. Barnabas were “observed in all cathedrals and chapels royal, where the service is read every day ; and in most parish churches also, as often as either of them falls upon a Sunday.”² Both these quotations show that, at that period, it was usual to give precedence over the Sunday to the holy day. The evidence of this is strong, because both the Conversion of St. Paul and St. Barnabas were then hardly placed on the same level with other saints’ days ; for though special offices were appointed for both days, the commemorations were not included in the list of holy days, which was headed by an order that “none other” should be kept. This was the case at the period named above, and until the last revision of 1661. There is also evidence in the reign of Edward VI. that Tuesday in Whitsun week was then considered of more moment

¹ Robertson, *How shall we conform to the Liturgy?* 3rd ed. 1869 ; p. 46.

² *Historical and Miscellaneous Tracts*, Lond., 1681 ; Part i. p. 17.

than St. Barnabas day, with which it coincided in 1549; the first celebration of St. Barnabas day under the first English Prayer Book was in 1550, although the Book had been in use from Whitsunday in the previous year.¹ From this we gather that at the time the pre-Reformation rule, that Whitsuntide was considered of greater importance than St. Barnabas, prevailed.

To show the dire need which exists for some guidance as to how to proceed when certain Sundays and holy days coincide, the following will suffice. As we have already briefly said, it is remarkable that, in the event of certain Sundays falling on certain holy days, there are actually no Second Lessons whatever appointed for the Sunday—thus there are proper Second Lessons appointed for the Circumcision and the Epiphany, but should these days occur with the first or the second Sunday after Christmas, respectively, there is no alternative but to read the Second Lessons of the former festivals. Between the years 1890 and 1908 there have been, or will be, some twenty occasions

¹ Heylyn, *History of Reformation*, ed. Eccles. Hist. Soc., i. 206, 207.

on which Sundays which have no Second Lessons appointed in the Lectionary must, of necessity, borrow those Lessons from the holy days on which they fall. When Christmas day falls on Tuesday, the Epiphany and the Second Sunday after Christmas will coincide. Now in the Lectionary, proper First Lessons are provided for the Sunday, but no Second Lessons, and no special Collect, Epistle, or Gospel. If the Sunday is to take precedence, it must borrow all its proper liturgical features (the First Lessons excepted) from the holy day; and if these more important features be used, as they of necessity must be used, surely, the First Lessons should be those of the Epiphany also, rather than those of the Second Sunday after Christmas. The fact that on the Epiphany the Athanasian Creed is appointed to supersede the Apostles' Creed of the Sunday Matins, likewise shows that it is the mind of the Church that the Epiphany should take precedence over the Sunday upon which at times it happens to fall.¹

¹ The Convocation Table, given later in the text, however, supersedes two holy days (St. Andrew, and St. Matthias) upon which the Athanasian Creed is appointed to be recited.

To take another example. When the Conversion of St. Paul falls on a Sunday, there are no Second Lessons for the Sunday appointed in the Lectionary. There is, therefore, again, no alternative but to read the Second Lessons for the Conversion; and if the Second Lessons be those for the Conversion, why not the First Lessons also? For there is a remarkable connexion between the First and Second Lessons for the Conversion, which no one who reads them consecutively can fail to notice. And if the Lessons at the Choir Offices be those for the Conversion of St. Paul, why not also the liturgical features of the Eucharist also? A similar conclusion, that certain holy days should over-ride Sundays with which they occur, is arrived at from a consideration of the rubrics which govern the offices for November 5th and May 29th in the Prayer Book of 1662. The rubric for the former occasion expressly states that if November 5th "shall happen to be a Sunday, only the Collect proper for the Sunday shall be added to this office in its place." A like provision is made for the office of May 29th, exception being made in the

case of that day being Whitsunday or Trinity Sunday; but if "any other Sunday, the whole office is to be used entirely." It is to be observed that both these services were approved by Convocation in 1661.

The only serious objection¹ that has been raised against giving to holy days precedence over Sundays with which they occur is that, whilst First Lessons from canonical Scripture only are invariably appointed for all the Sundays of the Christian year, the superseding of Sundays by holy days would interfere with this design. But as First Lessons from the deuterocanonical Books are appointed on three holy days only in the year (Holy Innocents, evening; St. Luke, evening; All Saints, morning and evening), the occasions on which First Lessons from the canonical Books would be displaced are so rare, that such objection is hardly worthy of consideration. For example, from the year 1901 to the year 1930, inclusive, during a period of thirty years, Holy Innocents occurs with Sunday six times, and St. Luke and All Saints five times each—in all, on sixteen

¹ Blunt, *Duties of the Parish Priest*, Lond., 1876; pp. 315, ff.

occasions—or, on an average, about once in two years would such displacement take place.

In the year A.D. 1843, the Rev. John Jebb published his valuable work, *The Choral Service of the United Church of England and Ireland*, in which is found¹ a table showing which of the holy days should, in his opinion, take precedence in cases of coincidence. This table is of great importance, since it evidently formed the model of the next serious attempt to deal with the subject of occurrences. In the year A.D. 1879, the question came before the Convocations of Canterbury and York, with the result that the Convocation of Canterbury² put forth a Table of Occurrences, which is printed on the next page. This table is practically identical with that suggested by Mr. Jebb in 1843; it is to be found in *The Convocation Prayer Book*,³ after the Table of Vigils, Fasts, etc.

¹ pp. 407-9.

² The Convocation of the Province of York unreasonably, in my opinion, refused assent.

³ London, John Murray, new ed., 1907; p. 24A.

**A TABLE TO REGULATE THE SERVICE WHEN TWO FEASTS
OR HOLY DAYS FALL UPON THE SAME DAY.**

When two feasts or holy days happen to fall upon the same day, then shall be said the whole service proper to the day placed in the left-hand column of the following table; and wheresoever in the service the collect for the day is appointed to be said, then shall immediately follow the collect for the day placed in the right-hand column :—

1 Sunday in Advent	St. Andrew
4 Sunday in Advent	St. Thomas
St. Stephen, St. John, Innocents' Day, Circumcision	1 Sunday after Christmas
Epiphany	2 Sunday after Christmas
Conversion of St. Paul	3 Sunday after the Epiphany
Presentation of Christ in the Temple, or Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary	4 Sunday after the Epiphany, Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquages. Sundays
Septuagesima and Sexagesima Sundays	Conversion of St. Paul
Sexagesima and Quinquagesima Sundays, Ash Wednesday, Sundays in Lent	St. Matthias
Annunciation	3, 4, 5 Sundays in Lent *
Sunday next before Easter, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday before Easter, Good Friday, Easter Even, Easter Day, Monday, Tuesday in Easter Week	Annunciation *
Easter Day, Monday, Tuesday in Easter Week, first Sunday after Easter	St. Mark
First Sunday after Easter	St. Philip and St. James
St. Mark, St. Philip and St. James Ascension Day	2, 3, 4, 5 Sundays after Easter
Whitsun Day, Whitsun Monday, and Whitsun Tuesday, Trinity Sunday	St. Philip and St. James
St. Barnabas, and all other Holy Days, till All Saints' Day inclusive	St. Barnabas
	Sundays after Trinity

* On these two directions, which are mistakes, see later, p. 101.

The Convocation Table appears to be drawn up on the following principles:—

I. Precedence over all other commemorations with which they may coincide is given to the festivals of our Lord—the Annunciation being regarded either as a festival of the Blessed Virgin Mary, or as a festival of our Lord giving way to other commemorations of Him in Holy Week and at Easter.

II. The more important Sundays—the two Sundays in Advent upon which holy days can fall; Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima Sundays; the Sundays in Lent; Easter day, with its two following days and its octave; Whitsunday, with its two following days and its octave (Trinity Sunday);—take precedence of saints' days. To this there is, however, one exception—namely, when the Annunciation supersedes certain Sundays in Lent, of which more below.

III. Holy days take precedence of the less important Sundays.

These principles represent the practice common at the beginning of the eighteenth century. In the year 1720, Charles Wheatly

stated¹:—"It is the common practise, indeed, to make the lesser holy day give way to the greater; as an ordinary Sunday, for instance, to a saint's day; a saint's day to one of our Lord's festivals; and a lesser festival of our Lord to a greater."

A comparison of the Convocation Table with the Sarum and Roman rules in certain disputed cases gives the following results:—

I. In giving the Purification precedence over Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima Sundays, the Convocation Table agrees with the Sarum rule, but differs from the Roman rule which gives to the three Sundays precedence over the Purification.

II. In giving the Annunciation precedence over the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Sundays in Lent, and also in giving the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday in Holy Week precedence over the Annunciation, the Convocation Table differs both from the Sarum and the old Roman²

¹ *A Rational Illustration*, p. 195.

² Previous to the reform of the Breviary by Pius V., A.D. 1570.

rules. Herein is found the serious mistake of the Convocation Table, which should be rectified. In both the Sarum and the old Roman rules the Sundays in Lent take precedence over the Annunciation; and the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday in Holy Week give way to the Annunciation.

The directions contained in the Convocation Table agree with those of the Sarum Pie, except that according to Sarum rules—

The Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Sundays in Lent take precedence of the Annunciation.

The Annunciation takes precedence of Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before Easter.

Thursday before Easter to Tuesday in Easter week inclusive, take precedence of the Annunciation.

When the Annunciation falls between Thursday before Easter and Wednesday after Easter, it is transferred to the first vacant day after Low Sunday.

When a saint's day falls on a Sunday which

takes precedence, the saint's day is transferred to the first vacant day.

When a saint's day falls on or is kept on Monday, Evensong on Sunday is the first Evensong of the feast, the Collect for Sunday being added.

When a saint's day falls on Saturday, Evensong on Saturday is the second Evensong of the feast, the Sunday Collect being added : except the Sunday be first in Advent or the Fifth or Sixth in Lent when Evensong on Saturday is that of the Sunday, the Collect of the feast being added.

When St. Matthias falls on Ash Wednesday, it is transferred to Thursday, the Evensong on Wednesday being that of Ash Wednesday, with the Collect for St. Matthias added.

When St. Philip and St. James falls on Ascension day, it is transferred to Friday, Evensong on Thursday being that of the Ascension, with the Collect for St. Philip and St. James added. When it falls on the Vigil of the Ascension, the Evensong on Wednesday is the first Evensong of the Ascension, with the Collect for St. Philip and St. James added.

When St. Barnabas falls between the Vigil of Pentecost and Saturday after Whitsunday inclusive, it is omitted that year.

From the following table it may be readily discovered in what years Sundays occur with fixed holy days :—

SUNDAY LETTER.	IMMOVABLE HOLY DAYS.
G	{ ANNUNCIATION, NAT. S. J. BAPT., SS. SIMON AND JUDE.
F	{ EPIPHANY, S. MATTHIAS, S. MICHAEL.
E	{ PURIFICATION, S. PETER, S. BARTHOLOMEW, S. MATTHEW, S. ANDREW, S. THOMAS, HOLY INNOCENTS.
D	{ CONV. S. PAUL, S. LUKE, ALL SAINTS, S. JOHN, EVAN.
C	{ S. MARK, S. JAMES, S. STEPHEN.
B	{ SS. PHILIP AND JAMES, CHRISTMAS DAY.
A	{ CIRCUMCISION, S. BARNABAS.

VIII

THE LENT FAST—ITS ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT

THE origin and development of the Lent Fast is a subject of great interest, and one which invites inquiry. Like other sacred institutions with which we are familiar, it took its rise from comparatively small beginnings, and only came to what it now is after many centuries of growth. It affords, in fact, in the ecclesiastical sphere, a most interesting and instructive example of the process which, in the natural sphere, is known as Evolution. For the Lent Fast has only reached its present form by slow stages, and after various vicissitudes, and in comparatively late times in the history of the Church. It is the purpose of this article to trace this growth of the Lent Fast from its original germ, and to show how

it has attained to its present proportions, and attracted to itself the significance attached to it in our own day.

1. From our childhood we have been taught and accustomed to regard the Forty Days of Lent as commemorative of our Lord's forty days' seclusion and fast in the wilderness, and to say, "We practise self-denial for forty days in Lent, because our Lord fasted in the wilderness during a like period." And this idea is confirmed in our minds, every year that Lent comes round, by the words of the familiar Collect, "O Lord, Who for our sake didst fast forty days and forty nights . . .," and by those of the Gospel, "Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil; and when He had fasted forty days and forty nights. . . ." But it may, perhaps, have struck some of the more thoughtful amongst us, that it is strange that the Church does not read this Collect and this Gospel, with their allusion to our Lord's forty days' fast, on Ash Wednesday, at the beginning of Lent, as we should naturally have expected, thereby striking at once the key-note of the

season, but only after the expiration of the first four days of the Lenten season. We are well into Lent, in fact, before any reference to our Lord's forty days' fast is made.

And this remarkable arrangement suggests obviously the question—Was Ash Wednesday always the first day of Lent, as it is said to be in the heading of the Collect of that day in the Prayer Book? and, Did Lent always consist of forty days, as we now count the week-days from Ash Wednesday to Easter Even? The omission of any reference to fasting, in the Collect or Collects¹ used on the first four days of Lent, suggests the suspicion that these four days were not always a part of that season, but a later addition. And, in like manner, another question is raised, as a consequence of what has been said—Had the observance of Lent originally any connexion with commemorating our Lord's forty days'

¹ The rubric following the Ash Wednesday Collect directs that Collect to "be read every day in Lent after the Collect appointed for the day," thus requiring two Collects to be said daily in Lent. "The Collect appointed for the day" on the three days following Ash Wednesday is that for Quinquagesima Sunday. See Article X. later.

fast in the desert; or was such a connexion merely a pious and edifying afterthought, as we know to have been the case in other instances of symbolism?

2. Now, whilst we inherit the Gospel for the First Sunday in Lent, with its reference to our Lord's forty days' fast, from the Sarum Missal, the Collect for that Sunday is not so ancient; for it is one of three new Collects of the Book of Common Prayer, first appearing in A.D. 1549, in the first English Prayer Book.¹ This Collect for the first Sunday in Lent bears remarkable witness (probably given unconsciously by those responsible for its compilation and introduction) to a fact of history—namely, that for a considerable period Lent consisted of but thirty-six days, and that the addition of Ash Wednesday and the three following days, was an enlargement of the Lenten season which came about in later times. Having said

¹ The other new Collects, added in 1662, are those for the Third Sunday in Advent, and St. Stephen's Day. It is remarkable that each of these three modern Collects, contrary to sound liturgical precedent in the case of prayers at the Eucharist, are addressed to the Second and not to the First Person of the Holy Trinity.

this, it will be well to commence at the beginning, and to search for the original germ of the Lenten season.

3. A fast of varying duration before Easter is one of the most ancient and universally observed institutions of the Christian Church—so ancient, that it may probably claim apostolic authorisation. Bishop Jeremy Taylor says:—"It is not to be denied but that from the very first ages of the Christian Church of which we have any records, it was with sacredness and religion observed that before the feast of Easter they should fast."¹ Thorndike says similarly: "It can never be said that there was any time or any part of the Church that did not fast before Easter."² The earliest unquestioned record of the observation of the Lent fast is that of Irenæus, who lived about ninety years from the death of the Apostle St. John, and who conversed familiarly with St. Polycarp, the friend of that apostle. Irenæus' reference, which is incidental, is

¹ Bp. Jeremy Taylor's *Works*, ed. Eden. Vol. x., p. 349.

² Thorndike's *Works*, Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol., Vol. iv. pt. ii. p. 503.

found in a letter to Victor, Bishop of Rome (A.D. 190-201), about the difference of the time of keeping the Easter solemnity. He says that there was also a divergence of custom in the observation of the previous fast. The words of Irenæus are—"For the controversy is not only concerning the day (Easter day), but also concerning the very form of the fast; for some suppose they ought to fast one day, others two, others forty (continued) hours of the day and night make (that space of time) their day (of fasting); and this variety in observing (the fast) has not been begun in our own age, but a long time ago, in the time of our ancestors."¹ From these closing words, we gather that the fast before Easter was no new institution at the close of the second century, but that it had for long been observed, having come down from a much earlier date, and having its origin "in the time of our ancestors." In fact the "long time ago" of which Irenæus speaks, justifies the supposition that he refers to Apostolic times the institution of the fast before Easter. In this earliest

¹ Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.*, V. 24.

notice of the fast before Easter, to which the designation *Quadragesima*, or Lent, had not yet been applied, we find that it was of but short duration: some fasted but one day, others but two, whilst others fasted for a number of days. It is the opinion of Mgr. Duchesne that these primitive fasts were continuous and uninterrupted,¹ which cannot be said of Lent as a prolonged season.

4. Our next source of information is Tertullian (A.D. 200), who knew of but one solemn fast only, prescribed by the Catholic Church—the day of the *Pascha*, a word which in this connexion he uses for Good Friday. In two of his treatises² he says, that the period of fasting included only those days on which the Bridegroom is taken away—“*quibus ablatus est Sponsus*,” that is, the fast was from Good Friday till Easter day, or the fast of Good Friday extended over the following day. I do not think it is open to doubt that we have here the origin of what developed later into the Lent fast, however the motive for keeping

¹ *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, viii. § 4, 3.

² *De Jejunio*, 2, 13, 14; *De Oratione*, 18.

it in later times came to differ from that of those who first observed it. Our Lord, on being questioned by His disciples about their fasting, replied: "Can the children of the bridechamber mourn, as long as the Bridegroom is with them? But the days will come when the Bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast."¹ And the primitive Christians took His words literally—they fasted during the time when He lay in the grave under the power of death. This time was about, if not actually, forty hours, as may readily be reckoned. And thus the idea of forty hours, as we may reasonably believe, lay at the root of the term *Τεσσαρακοστή*, or its Latin equivalent *Quadragesima*, "the fortieth," a term which later was attached to the fast before Easter, and became the technical expression for the Lent fast even before it was enlarged to comprise forty days. Duchesne says that of the *Quadragesima* no trace is found before the fourth century;²—apparently using the term in relation to days, rather than to hours. For it is in the fifth

¹ St. Matt. ix. 15.

² *Origines*, viii. § 4, 3.

Canon of the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325) that we find the earliest yet discovered mention of *Quadragesima*. As to the precise meaning assigned to the word by the fathers of that Council, we are in the dark; they allude to it incidentally as a note of time, and as well known. The purpose of this Canon was to establish annual Provincial Synods, at which appeals from sentences of excommunication might be settled; one of which was held before Lent, and intended to remove disputes in view of a peaceful celebration of the Easter solemnities.¹ But it seems almost certain that the Nicene fathers did not use the term *Quadragesima* to signify a fast of forty days before Easter; in fact, we find the word used of the fast before Easter when the number of the days in the West was but thirty-six. The Edessene Canons, which are a little later than the date of the Council of Nicæa, however, speak of a fast of forty days before the Passion; and, a little later, St. Athanasius ordered a fast of forty days, thus showing that the custom of observing a season of forty days,

¹ Wordsworth, *The Ministry of Grace*, 1903; p. 366.

was beginning to take root, though by no means universally. For when Lent had come in some places to consist of forty days, yet the duration of the season varied considerably in different parts of the Church. Socrates, in his *Ecclesiastical History*¹ expressed perplexity that Τεσσαρακοστή, the Greek term for *Quadragesima*, was generally used to describe a fasting season which varied in places from seven to three weeks in duration. Sozomen, in the fifth century, marks similar variations of time. The custom of the Latin Church at the period and onwards was to keep a Lent of six weeks, Sundays excepted; and this constituted a season of thirty-six days. It is to be observed that whilst the Church of Constantinople kept a Lent of seven weeks, there was no fasting permitted on Saturdays and Sundays, thus the Lent of the Church of Constantinople was of thirty-five days duration. Pope Gregory

¹ "The Romans fast three weeks before Easter, the Sabbath and Lord's Day excepted. The Illyrians, and all Greece, and the Alexandrians fast six weeks, and call it the Quadragesimal fast. Others begin their fast seven weeks before Easter, only fasting, however, fifteen days by intervals; but they also call this the Quadragesimal fast."—Socrates, *Eccles. Hist.*, v. 22.

the Great (A.D. 590–604), in speaking of the Lent Fast, says,—“From this present day unto the joys of the Paschal solemnity [Easter] there are six weeks coming”—*i.e.*, thirty-six days, excluding Sundays, “that we who through the past year have lived (too much) to ourselves, should mortify ourselves to our Creator in the tenth of the year through abstinence. Whence, most dear brethren, as ye are bid by the Law to offer the tenths of your substance, so contend to offer Him also the tenths of your days.”¹ The Eighth Council of Toledo, A.D. 653, in its ninth canon, also describes the thirty-six days of Lent as a tithe of the whole year, offered specially to God by the Christian people. This idea of the Lent fast being the dedication of one-tenth part of the year to God in penitential exercises, is named by Cassian (A.D. c. 355–c. 445), a century and a half before the time of Gregory the Great, as indicated above.

5. Our present custom of regarding Ash Wednesday as the first day of a Lent of forty

¹ *Homil.* 16. in *Evangell.*, qu. Gunning, *The Lent Fast*, Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol., pp. 64, 65.

days, does not appear to have been known so late as the time of Pope Gregory II. (A.D. 715-731). It seems that the addition of the four days before the First Sunday in Lent was made in order to make up the more ancient period of thirty-six days to forty days, in imitation of the fasts of Moses and Elijah, and of our Lord. Traces of this change having taken place may be gathered from the fact that, in the Breviaries of some Western dioceses, the Lenten hymns do not begin until the First Sunday in Lent; in accordance with what has been said at the commencement of this article, in regard to the Collects for Ash Wednesday and that Sunday in the Book of Common Prayer. Dr. J. M. Neale states that "it was not till the final alteration of the Mozarabic Rite by Cardinal Ximenes (c. A.D. 1500), that the season of Lent was extended backwards to Ash Wednesday. Till then, it commenced, as does the Ambrosian [Rite] to this day, with the First Sunday [in Lent], thus containing only thirty-six days complete; the tenth part, roughly measured, of the whole year."¹ As late as the

¹ Neale, *Essays on Liturgiology*, vi. 187. See *Cerimoniale*

eleventh century, St. Margaret, Queen of Scotland, introduced the custom of commencing Lent on Ash Wednesday in the Church of that land.¹ Whilst St. Charles Borromeo (A.D. 1538-84), in the first council at which he presided, justified the right by which the Church of Milan had retained the practice of not beginning Lent until its first Sunday, in accordance with ancient usage.² Doubtless, he had in mind St. Ambrose's censure of those who commenced the Lent Fast during the week of Quinquagesima.³ From all this it will be seen that the observance of a Lent of forty days' duration cannot claim to be a Catholic custom.

6. From the fact that the Lent Fast was not originally kept in commemoration of our Lord's fast in the wilderness, nor observed in comparison with or imitation of its duration of

Dei Vesperi, secondo il Rito Ambrosiano, Milano, 1857; "De Quadragesima," § 72, p. 81; which gives the present use at Milan in accordance with Dr. Neale's statement. St. Ambrose, serm. 34, blames those who began the fast in Quinquagesima week.

¹ Addis and Arnold, *A Catholic Dictionary*, Lond., 1893; sub "Lent," p. 559.

² Ibid.

³ See footnote above.

forty days, it is interesting to inquire when and where this connexion, with which we have grown so familiar, arose. The earliest mention of the Lent Fast being observed in imitation of our Lord's forty days' fast is, I believe, found in the Edessene canons, which date from the first half of the fourth century, and may be reckoned as slightly later than the Council of Nicæa. In the Edessene canons (vii.) we find a fast of forty days prescribed; "and *then* celebrate the day of the Passion, and the day of the Resurrection; because our Lord Himself fasted forty days, and likewise Moses and Elijah."¹ St. Gregory Nazianzen, who died A.D. 391, appears to be the first amongst the fathers to compare or connect the fast before Easter with the fast of our Lord.—"Christ fasted a little before His temptation; we before Easter; the matter of fastings is one . . . Christ indeed fasted forty days, for He was God; but we proportionate this to our power: though zeal carry some beyond their strength."² St.

¹ See "Syriac Documents" in *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, p. 39.

² Greg. Naz., Orat. 40, qu Gunning, *The Lent Fast*, p. 36.

Ambrose, who died A.D. 397, likewise says,—
“For the Lord after He had fasted forty days
overcame the devil . . . that He might shew
unto us, that then we can overcome the devil,
when by forty days we have been through
fasting victors over our own carnal desires.”¹

It is most interesting to observe that Nazianzus, the town from which St. Gregory gets his designation, was not very far from Edessa; and that the predecessor of St. Ambrose in the see of Milan was a Cappadocian. The similarity of the teaching of these two fathers with that of the seventh of the Edessene canons concerning the Lent Fast is worthy of notice. A little later, St. Jerome writes similarly, with the added allusion to the forty days' fasts of Moses and Elijah,—“Moses and Elias, by their fast of forty days, were filled with the converse of God; and our Lord himself fasted the same number of days in solitude, that He might leave to us the solemn days of fasting.”² St. Augustine at about the same time, says—“We are admonished to fast forty days; this the

¹ Serm. xxi., qu Gunning, p. 39.

² *In Isai.* lib. xvi. c. 58; also *In Yona*, c. 3.

Law, whose person Moses bare; this the Prophets, whose person Elias sustained; this the Lord himself admonisheth us, who as receiving witness from the Law and the Prophets, shone forth in the midst betwixt those two in the mount. . . ."¹ But the fact that for long after this time, the Western Church adhered to the period of thirty-six days, shows that a comparison between our Lord's forty days' fast and the fast before Easter was not recognised universally. Before passing on, it is worthy of notice that the use of the Transfiguration Gospel, with its allusion to Moses and Elijah, sometime during Lent, is well-nigh universal. It was so used on the Lent Ember Saturday in the Missals of Salisbury, Hereford, York, and Westminster.

7. In finally observing a Lent of forty days, the Church very probably had in view, not only the length of time that our Lord fasted, but also the very frequent allusions to periods of forty days named in Holy Scripture, some of which had a specially penitential character. We have a hint of this in the Edessene canons,

¹ *Lib. ii de Doctrina Christiana*, c. 16.

and in the words of SS. Jerome and Augustine, quoted above, in which reference is prominently made to the forty days' fasts of Moses and Elijah.¹ Amongst such allusions are—the rain which caused the flood continued forty days; the spies spent forty days in searching the promised land; Ezekiel's bearing the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days; the threatened overthrow of Nineveh after forty days.² In another connexion it may be here noticed that our Lord was presented in the temple when forty days old, and that He remained on earth after His resurrection forty days: whilst St. Augustine, symbolically speaking, connects the forty days fast of Lent with our Lord's descent through forty generations.

8. Of the institution of the Lent Fast as a period of preparation for Baptism at Easter, a good deal might be said from a reference to its early history; this purpose being assigned to the fast before Easter from the earliest times. In later times, when the reception of Holy Communion became very infrequent, all were

¹ Deut. ix. 9, 18, 25; 1 Kings xix. 8.

² Gen. vii. 4; Num. xiv. 34; Ezek. iv. 6; Jonah iii. 4.

urged to receive at Easter ; and hence the Lent Fast came to be regarded as a season for retirement and penitential devotions in preparation for the Easter Communion ; and this is the character assigned to it in our own day.

IX

TE DEUM AND *BENEDICTUS* AND ALTER NATIVE CANTICLES

TWICE a year—at the approach of the season of Septuagesima and Lent, and again at the approach of Advent—the vexed question arises as to the advisability of the omission at Morning Prayer of the *Te Deum laudamus*, and the substitution of the *Benedicite omnia opera* for that Cantic, as is more or less strongly urged in various calendars and liturgical directories which are current. Considerable diversity of opinion obtains upon this question. In the interests of liturgical propriety and reverence, every detail connected with the conduct of Divine Service is of importance and is worthy of careful consideration. It seems desirable, therefore, that some investigation of this matter should be attempted, in order that those

responsible for the ordering of the Church Service may be able, once for all, to arrive at a satisfactory decision, grounded, not on private likes or dislikes, but upon sound liturgical principles, as to what is best to be done. There appears, from experience, to be need of a like consideration in regard to the use of the second morning Cantic, the *Benedictus* or its alternative, the *Jubilate Deo*. It is the purpose of this article to give information upon these points of liturgy, as the result of some original research.

TE DEUM AND BENEDICITE

In the Book of Common Prayer the rubric directs that, after the First Lesson ended, "shall be said or sung, in English, the hymn called *Te Deum laudamus*, daily throughout the year." After the *Te Deum* stands the rubric, "Or this Cantic, *Benedicite omnia opera*." These rubrics have appeared in each revision of the Prayer Book from 1552 to 1662. There is here no indication given as to any rule controlling the particular use of either

Canticle, and, looking at the rubrics apart from any tradition or appeal to earlier precedent, it may be pleaded that the *Te Deum* may be used and the *Benedicite* omitted, or *vice versâ*, at the will of the minister. But it may well be doubted if the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer were ever intended by those responsible for drawing them up to be so treated. And, certainly, the liturgical research of the last twenty years has shed so much light on the rubrical directions of the Prayer Book, and the extreme advantage of consulting history and precedent has become in many cases so apparent, that any such summary method of arriving at decisions is not to be commended. The laity have a right to expect the clergy to be well informed on all liturgical arrangements, and to act according to knowledge as opposed to self-pleasing. As an instance of the mistake of reading rubrics without regard to precedent, the case of Robert Johnson, Chaplain to the Lord Keeper Bacon, is of significance. Johnson was charged, A.D. 1573, by Queen Elizabeth's High Commissioners, among whom was Edwin Sandys, Bishop of London, and the Lord Chief

Justice, with omitting, when needed, to consecrate more of either element in the Eucharist beyond that which had been first consecrated and exhausted. Johnson pleaded that one consecration sufficed, and that, since there was no direction in Elizabeth's Prayer Book for a further consecration, omission implied prohibition. The plea that in this matter Johnson was justified in omitting that which was not definitely ordered by the rubrics was treated with great contempt by the Court, which judged him guilty, imprisoned and fined him.¹ An equally if not more remarkable case is named by Bishop E. Gibson of London :—

“ In the reign of King James I., an order was made by the Chancellor of Norwich, that every woman who came to be churched should come covered with a white vail. A woman, refusing to conform, was excommunicated for contempt, and pray'd a prohibition ; alledging, that such order was not warranted by any

¹ Grueber, *Three Recent Decisions*, 1875 ; p. 21, from *A parte of a Register*, pp. 105-111.

custom or canon of the Church of England. The judges desired the opinion of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who convened divers Bishops to consult thereupon ; and they certifying, that it was the ancient usage of the Church of England, for women who came to be churched, to come veiled, a prohibition was denied."¹

At this time the direction that the woman should come into the church "decently apparelled" was not inserted in the rubric. Heylyn tells us that the general prevalence of custom at the time of the Reformation made it unnecessary to give any order concerning certain ceremonial or liturgical observances. He speaks of things "retained by virtue of some ancient usages not by law prohibited."² As a further instance of the need of consulting precedent in order to interpret or supplement the directions of the Book of Common Prayer, the following will suffice :—When Christmas

¹ Gibson, *Codex Iuris*, Oxford, 1761 ; Tit. XVIII. cap. xii. p. 373.

² Heylyn, *Hist. of Reformation*, 1661 ; fol. 296.

day happens on a Tuesday, as was the case in A.D. 1906, the Epiphany and the Second Sunday after Christmas coincide. Now in the Lectionary, whilst proper First Lessons are provided for the Sunday, neither Second Lessons, Collect, Epistle, nor Gospel are appointed for the Sunday. If the Sunday is to take precedence, all its proper liturgical features (the First Lessons excepted) must be borrowed from the Epiphany ; but the Prayer Book gives no directions that this is to be done—we must consult precedent for guidance. And the same may be said in regard to the use or non-use of the *Te Deum*, and the substitution of the *Benedicite* in its place, if precedent is forthcoming.

Let us now consider what may be gathered from an appeal to English precedent in the matter of the choice of *Te Deum* or *Benedicite*. In the first place, whilst, as we have seen above, the present apparent liberty to use either Canticle on any occasion whatever dates from the time of the issue of the Second Prayer Book of King Edward VI., A.D. 1552, for a period of three years, or thereabouts,

previously the choice of the first Canticle at Morning Prayer was limited by the rubric of the First Prayer Book of A.D. 1549, which was:—"After the fyrste lesson shall folowe *Te deum laudamus* in Englyshe, dayly throughout the yeare, excepte in Lente, all the whiche tyme in the place of *Te deum* shalbe vsed *Benedicite omnia opera Domini Domino*, in Englyshe as foloweth."¹ This rubric was a somewhat clumsy attempt to enforce, to some limited extent, the generally prevailing use of pre-Reformation times—namely, that *Te Deum* should not be used in penitential seasons. But the rubric of 1549 was at variance with more ancient precedent in two particulars of moment—

(a) In directing the *Te Deum* to be recited "daily"—that is, on week days as well as on Sundays. According to Sarum use the *Te Deum* was only said or sung on Sundays and festivals outside penitential seasons; and not "daily throughout the year." And the direction so to recite it was a distinct innovation on the part of the Reformers of Edward VI.'s

¹ *The First Prayer-book of Edward VI.*, De la More Press, 1903, p. 23.

time, at least according to the diocesan uses of the pre-Reformation English Church, probably made with a view to simplify the liturgical arrangements of the first English Prayer Book—the Hereford Breviary, however, ordered *Te Deum* to be said on week-days from the Nativity to the Purification, and from Easter Monday till the Saturday before Trinity Sunday, certain days excepted, as noted below, p. 135.

(b) The rubric was also at variance with precedent in appointing the *Benedicite* as a substitute for the *Te Deum*; for the latter hymn was a Sunday and festival Canticle of Mattins, whilst the *Benedicite* was a Sunday Canticle of Lauds, not used on week-days. Also on the Sundays and festivals of Advent, on which *Te Deum* was omitted, the following was sung in place thereof, according to Sarum use—namely, the last of the nine Responds used after the nine Lessons respectively :—

R. 9. Laetentur coeli, et exultet terra : iubilare montes laudem : quia Dominus noster veniet. Et pauperum suorum miserebitur.

V. Orietur in diebus eius iustitia et abundantia pacis. Et pauperum suorum miserebitur.

Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto :
Et pauperum suorum miserebitur.

The ancient use of the *Benedicite* was entirely festive, though it was not set aside, as *Te Deum* was, from its place at Lauds during Advent and Lent.

Before proceeding further in our inquiry it may be well to quote the rubrics of the Sarum Breviary¹ which regulate the use of *Te Deum*. Translated, they are as follows :—

1. After the Anthem [Response] and Verse following the third and last Lesson of the third Nocturn at Mattins on Sundays, there follows—"The Song of Ambrose and Augustine, uttered at the baptism of the said Augustine." Then follows the full text of *Te Deum laudamus*.²

2. After the Response and Verse following the third and last Lesson of the third Nocturn at Mattins on the First Sunday in

¹ *The Sarum Breviary*, editt. Procter and Chr. Wordsworth Cambridge, 1879.

² *Ibid.*, Fasc. II. col. 27. The tradition attributing the composition of *Te Deum* to Ambrose and Augustine was of comparatively late origin, and cannot be maintained as historically true. The English Reformers wisely rejected it.

Advent, we find—" *Te Deum* shall not be said throughout the whole of Advent, whatever the service may be, but the ninth Responsory shall be begun again ; and this only on Sundays, and on feasts of nine Lessons. Also *Te Deum laudamus* shall not be said throughout the whole year on Vigils and on Ember days, except on the Vigil of the Epiphany, when it shall occur on a Sunday, and except on the Ember days in the week of Pentecost." ¹

3. After the Response and Verse following the third and last Lesson of the third Nocturn at Mattins on Septuagesima Sunday follows :—"From this day [Septuagesima] until Easter *Te Deum* shall not be said, whether the service be the proper of the season or the proper of saints, but the ninth Responsory shall be always begun again, and on the feasts of nine Lessons only. For the Responsory is not to be repeated in the Commemorations of Blessed Mary, nor on the feast of the place." ²

4. On Christmas day at Mattins, after the

¹ *The Sarum Breviary*, editt. Procter and Chr. Wordsworth, Cambridge, 1879 ; Fasc. I., col. xxix.

Ibid., Fasc. I., col. cccxciii.

Gospel, St. Matt. i. 1-16, after the Response and the Verse following the ninth Lesson (that is, the third Lesson of the third Nocturn), is :—
 "The Gospel ended, let the officiant, vested in a silken cope, in his stall, without changing his place, begin the Psalm *Te Deum*, with loud voice" ¹

5. On Easter day at Mattins, after the Response and its Verse following the third Lesson in the one Nocturn, is :—"Let the officiant, in his stall, vested in a silken cope, the appointed Response with its Verse having been ended, with loud voice begin the Psalm *Te Deum*." ²

6. On St. Andrew's day [being a feast of nine Lessons], after the Response and Verse following the third Lesson in the third Nocturn, is :—"If this feast falls in Advent, *Te Deum* is not said, but the Response is repeated." ³

7. As in 4 above, on the Feast of the

¹ *The Sarum Breviary*, editt. Procter and Chr. Wordsworth, Cambridge, 1879 ; Fasc. I., col. clxxxvii.

² *Ibid.*, Fasc. I., col. dccccxiv.

³ *Ibid.*, Fasc. III., col. 15.

Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, a feast of nine Lessons, always falling in Advent, "*Te Deum* is not said."¹

8. On the Feast of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary, a feast of nine Lessons :—
"If Septuagesima Sunday falls on this day, let the whole service be that of the feast, but without *Alleluia* and *Te Deum*."²

The York Breviary agrees with that of Sarum in omitting *Te Deum* in Advent, Septuagesima and Lent.³

Amongst the rubrics of the Hereford Breviary is the following :—

"It is to be noted that the Psalm *Te Deum* is not said throughout the whole of Advent, whatever the service may be. From the Nativity, however, until the Purification, whatever the service may be, whether ferial or

¹ *The Sarum Breviary*, editt. Procter and Chr. Wordsworth, Cambridge, 1879; Fasc. III., col. 50.

² *Ibid.*, Fasc. III., col. 147.

³ *Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesiae Eboracensis*, Surtees Soc., 1880; Vol. I. coll. 86, 87.

festival, the Psalm *Te Deum* is said, unless Septuagesima precedes the Purification. And henceforward [from the Purification] to Lent, whatever the service may be, the Psalm *Te Deum* is said, except on ferial days in Septuagesima. And henceforward [from Septuagesima] until Easter day the Psalm *Te Deum* is not said. From Easter day and onwards until Trinity Sunday, and on ferial days also during that time, the Psalm *Te Deum* is said, except on Rogation days and the vigils of the Ascension and Whitsunday, on which ferial days and vigils, whatever the service may be, the Psalm *Te Deum* is not said, except on any feast when the quire is ruled which happens in that period. On Trinity Sunday, and from thence until Advent, ferial days and All Souls' day excepted, the Psalm *Te Deum* is said. But on feasts of three Lessons occurring on vigils of saints' days happening during the same period, the Psalm *Te Deum* is not said. On commemorations of the feast of the church, and of blessed Mary and on her solemn commemorations, if the same happen to fall on such vigils, the Psalm *Te Deum* is not said,

because the quire is not ruled at Vespers and Mattins.”¹

It may be repeated here that when *Te Deum* was used it was always used at Mattins, and only on Sundays and festivals outside penitential seasons and days—*i.e.*, Lent, Advent, Vigils, &c.—and that *Benedicite* was used at Lauds on Sundays only throughout the year, and it was not, therefore set aside in Advent and Lent.

From this summary it will be seen that, according to Sarum rules, whilst *Te Deum* was considered inappropriate for use on Sundays and festivals in Advent and Lent, *Benedicite* was not. But there is no precedent from the same source for the use of either Canticle “daily throughout the year.” All that can be said as to week-day use (holy-days apart) is that analogy leads to the conclusion that *Te Deum*—at least the first two divisions of it—has a festival character in excess of *Benedicite*.

Applying the Sarum, York, and Hereford rules to the interpretation of the rubric of

¹ *The Hereford Breviary*, editt. Frere and Brown, H. Bradshaw Soc., 1904 ; Vol. I., p. 147. *In die Nativitatis Domini*.

the Book of Common Prayer, the conclusion appears to be—that *Te Deum* may appropriately be used on all Sundays and festival days which do not fall in Advent, Septuagesima, and Lent: and also, in accordance with the Hereford Use, on the week-days of Eastertide and Pentecost, enlarging the latter time to include the week of Trinity Sunday (that is, from Easter Monday to the Saturday after Trinity Sunday—the Rogation fasting days¹ excepted), and on the week-days of Christmas and Epiphany (that is, from St. Stephen's day to the Saturday before Septuagesima); these week-days are such as—Holy Innocents and the Whitsun Ember days¹ excepted—have a festival character, white being the prevailing liturgical colour. Roughly speaking, this

¹ From a reference to rubric 2 quoted above, it will be observed that according to Sarum use *Te Deum* was said on the Whitsun Ember days. This is the one inconsistency (with the exception of the Vigil of the Epiphany) of the Sarum directions as to the disuse of *Te Deum*. In it we find a protest against observing fasting days during a festival season, the Ember days in question falling within the octave of Whitsunday. It may be doubted if the Vigil of the Epiphany was actually fasted under the Sarum rules. See Staley, *The Fasting Days*, Mowbrays, 1899; pp. 32, 33, and references given there.

arrangement would give the use of *Te Deum* to thirty-nine Sundays, twenty festivals not Sundays, and eighty-three week-days, or about 140 occasions in the year; leaving thirteen Sundays—that is, four of Advent and nine in Septuagesima and Lent—and about 210 week-days, including festival days, in penitential seasons—that is, about 220 occasions on which *Benedicite* would be used. By this arrangement *Te Deum* would be used as a festival Canticle according to the analogy of pre-Reformation times—the preponderance of its use on Sundays making up for the larger number of times the *Benedicite* would be recited on ferial days. From the total of thirty-nine Sundays to which *Te Deum* is thus assigned, one Sunday should be deducted—namely, the Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity, when the first Lesson is Daniel iii., which records the committal of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego to the fiery furnace, in which they praised God in the words of the *Benedicite*. This would give thirty-eight Sundays for *Te Deum*, and fourteen Sundays for *Benedicite*.

Having indicated what appear to be only

true rules for the use of *Te Deum* and *Benedicite*, based on the analogy of the Sarum and Hereford rubrics, it remains to make some remarks which to a certain degree modify these conclusions, and prevent the assuming that no deviation from them is admissible under any circumstances. The Western monastic rule varies considerably from that which prevailed in the pre-Reformation English dioceses, to which reference has been made above; for, by the former, *Te Deum* is said on all Sundays of the year, even on the Sundays in Advent and in Septuagesima and Lent; and in some cases even on Holy Innocents' day. Its recitation on the Sundays of Advent by certain of the monastic Orders, as we shall see later,¹ is specially to be noted as a departure from mediæval English use: and in this we probably find a trace of the earlier view of Advent as a season of joy, and not of penitence, commemorative of the First Coming of our Lord. For the penitential aspect of Advent only emerges into prominence later, when the expectation of the Second Coming to judgment was emphasised as the

¹ See pp. 140, 141.

leading thought of the Advent season. The monastic use of *Te Deum* in Advent is consistent with that of *Alleluia* and *Gloria in excelsis* in ancient times during that season—"Il est certain que les plus anciens documents liturgiques n'ont pas ce caractère de pénitence," as Dom Fernand Cabrol expresses it, referring to the Advent season.¹

As early as the eleventh century the Benedictines recited *Te Deum* on Sundays in Advent and Lent, though reproached for so doing.² Dr. J. M. Neale has pointed out that in the Benedictine Order this use still obtains, and that at Lyons the same custom remained until A.D. 1780; whilst at St. Martin of Tours *Te Deum* was said on the Innocents' Day until A.D. 1635; "as, we believe, it still is at Paris, Lyons, Vienne, Quimper, Chartres, Laon, and other places."³ J. B. le Brun Desmarettes notes in his Travels that, at the close of the seventeenth century, or thereabouts, *Te Deum*

¹ *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, Paris, 1907; sub "Avent," col. 3226.

² Addis and Arnold, *A Catholic Dictionary*, Lond., 1893; sub "Te Deum," p. 873.

³ Neale, *Essays in Liturgiology*, Lond., 1863; i. 35.

was said sometimes on Palm Sunday at Vienne; on the Sundays of Advent and Lent at Lyons and throughout the Order of Benedictines, and at St. Martin of Tours up to the year 1635; on the Wednesday of the Advent Ember Week at Mattins at Bourges; and on Holy Innocents' day at Vienne, Lyons, and St. Martin of Tours¹—thus confirming Dr. Neale's statement. I am indebted to Dom Columba Edmonds, of St. Benedict's Abbey, Fort Augustus, for the information that, according to the Rule of St. Benedict (cc. xi., xii.), *Te Deum* is said on all Sundays of the year and on all saints' days and solemnities of twelve Lessons; and that it is omitted, and nothing substituted for it, on all ferias and whenever the Office is one of three Lessons. From this it may be gathered that the Sarum and Hereford restrictions were by no means universal in the Western Church. Quignonez, in his reformed Roman Breviary, directed *Te Deum* to be used for festivals even in Advent and Lent.

¹ De Moleon (Le Brun Desmarettes), *Voyages Liturgiques de France*, Paris, 1718; Index, "Te Deum laudamus," p. 571.

The substitution of *Benedicite* for *Te Deum* on penitential occasions cannot be regarded as satisfactory, for the former Canticle consists of "one unbroken song of jubilant adoration," and does not contain the faintest penitential allusion of any kind whatever. This cannot be said of the *Te Deum*, for "the *Te Deum* has mingled with its triumphant praise the tenderest pleadings for mercy, the acknowledgment of human weakness, and the memories of the humiliation of the King of Glory when He took upon Him to deliver man."¹ Comparing the two Canticles, and putting aside for the moment tradition and precedent, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that *Benedicite* is less appropriate for seasons of penitence than *Te Deum*. And this is conspicuously the case in regard to the choice of a first Canticle for use during Advent, for what could possibly be more appropriate to and in harmony with the truths of the First and the Second Coming of our Lord than the verses—"When Thou tookest upon Thee to deliver man, Thou didst

¹ Bp. Dowden, *The Workmanship of the Prayer-book*, Lond. 1902 ; p. 244.

not abhor the Virgin's womb," and "We believe that Thou shalt come to be our Judge"? With no other alternative Canticle than the *Benedicite* available for Advent, if pre-Reformation English precedent is against us, as it is undoubtedly, there cannot be a question that, for appropriateness, *Te Deum*, with its final verses of supplication, is preferable to *Benedicite*, with its persistent and continued strain of triumph, for use in the Advent season. And with regard to Lent, if neither Canticle is suitable, as is freely admitted, the *Benedicite*, again, is least so, from its complete lack of penitential devotion. What is urgently needed is a third alternative Canticle, suited to seasons of penitence and fasting. And there would be no difficulty in supplying such an alternative from Holy Scripture. For example, admirable substitutes for both *Te Deum* and *Benedicite* are to be found in two of the discarded Canticles of Lauds—the Song of Hezekiah, Isaiah xxxviii. 9 ff., exquisitely appropriate for Lent, and the Prayer of Habakkuk, iii., exceedingly suitable for Advent.

In conclusion, I would suggest that, in cases

where *Te Deum* is used on days which do not possess a festival character, something might be done to mitigate its jubilation and triumphal strain, by singing it to music of subdued character, from which high notes in the melody are excluded, marking the three separate hymns of which it is composed¹ by the use of varying chants, and deliberately assigning to the third division a chant of minor key.

BENEDICTUS AND JUBILATE

The provision of Psalm c. (*Jubilate Deo*) as a substitute for the *Benedictus* is an heritage of doubtful value, which has come down to us from the time of the Second Prayer-book of Edward VI., A.D. 1552—the most unsatisfactory of the various revisions of the Book of Common Prayer. In 1662 the Revisers altered the rubric to read:—"Then shall be read the Second Lesson. . . . And after that, the

¹ The three hymns which compose the *Te Deum* are—i. verses 1-13, beginning, "We praise Thee . . .," ii. verses 14-21 beginning, "Thou art the King of Glory . . .," iii. verses 22-29 beginning, "O Lord, save Thy people. . . ." See Bp. J. Wordsworth's *The "Te Deum," its Structure, &c.*, S.P.C.K., 1903; pp. 8 ff.

Hymn following [*Benedictus*]; except when that shall happen to be read in the Chapter for the day, or for the Gospel on St. John Baptist's day." This direction is so definite that it is only right for the *Benedictus* to give place to the *Jubilate* on two occasions, if not three, in the year. St. Luke i. 68 ff. is appointed for the Gospel on St. John Baptist's day; and it is also read in the course of the Second Lesson at Mattins on Lady day, and at Evensong on September 24th. It is true that, strictly speaking, the rubric refers to the Lectionary of 1662, and not to that of 1871 now in use, when the *Benedictus* occurred in the Lessons at Mattins only, on February 18th, June 17th, and October 15th. But the change of Lectionary in 1871 did not affect the principle of the rubric, which was, obviously, that the same portion of Scripture should not be sung as a Canticle on the same morning on which it was read as a Lesson. Moreover, there was in 1662 a reason for the prohibition, which is far less marked in the case of the present Lectionary; for in 1662 the *Benedictus* would, in the course of nine months, have been repeated thrice in

L

sequence at Mattins on the dates named above ; whilst, under the present Lectionary, such is the case only once in the year—namely, on March 25th.

Formerly, the *Jubilate* was the second of the fixed Psalms at Lauds on Sunday, so that some ancient authority may be pleaded for its occasional use as directed by the rubric. No liberty, however, is given for omission of the *Benedictus* at any other times than those specified—namely, when it shall be read in the Chapter for the day, or for the Gospel on St. John Baptist's day.

X

A LITURGICAL PERPLEXITY

THERE are four groups of days which occur during the course of the liturgical year, when a certain amount of perplexity exists in regard to the use of Collect, Epistle, and Gospel. The first case is that of such days as may intervene between the festival of the Holy Innocents and the Sunday after Christmas ; the second is that of such days as may fall between the Epiphany and the following Sunday ; the third is that of the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday following Ash Wednesday ; the fourth is that of the Friday and Saturday after the Ascension day. In the first case the question is raised, Are the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel to be those appointed for the Fourth Sunday in Advent, or for the Nativity ? In the second, Are the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel to be those appointed

for the Epiphany, or those used on the Sunday before the Epiphany? In the third, Are the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel to be those of Ash Wednesday, or those of Quinquagesima Sunday? In the fourth, Are the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the Ascension Day to be used on the Friday and Saturday following, or those appointed for Rogation Sunday? It will be convenient for our purpose to discuss these cases in the following order.

I. It has been ruled by certain students of liturgy that the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for Quinquagesima Sunday are proper to the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday after Ash Wednesday—the Ash Wednesday Collect alone being added after the Quinquagesima Collect. Those of the contrary opinion—namely, that the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for Ash Wednesday should be repeated daily until the First Sunday in Lent—urge that it is inappropriate after the commencement of the forty days of the Lenten season to go back to the special liturgical features of the previous Sunday. In answer to this objection, which is not without

weight, it may be pleaded that the Book of Common Prayer expressly directs that "the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel appointed for the Sunday shall serve all the week after, where it is not in this Book otherwise ordered."¹ If we read the rubric which follows the Collect for Ash Wednesday we find, "This Collect is to be read every day in Lent after the Collect appointed for the day." The only "Collect appointed for the day" in the case of the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday before the First Sunday in Lent is the Collect for Quinquagesima Sunday. Moreover, this rubric requires *two* Collects to be used, and not the Collect for Ash Wednesday only. A rigid conformity to the directions of the Book of Common Prayer quoted above leads to the conclusion that the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for Quinquagesima are the proper features for the three days following Ash Wednesday, the Collect for that day being added after the Quinquagesima Collect.

In endeavouring to solve disputed points in

¹ *The Order how the rest of Holy Scripture is appointed to be read*, last note.

such matters as that before us, it is reasonable to consult pre-Reformation English custom. But in this instance such an appeal yields no conclusive answer, because a special and varying Collect, Epistle, and Gospel were appointed for each of the three days following Ash Wednesday, and, in fact, for every ferial day of Lent. All that we can draw out from an appeal to precedent is that neither the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for Quinquagesima Sunday, nor those for Ash Wednesday, were used in the pre-Reformation times upon the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday before the First Sunday in Lent; other provision being made for the liturgical features in question on the three days named. It is interesting to observe that in the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637 the rubric directs that "from Ash Wednesday to the First Sunday in Lent shall be used the same Collect, Epistle and Gospel which were used on Ash Wednesday." In accordance with this ruling of the Scottish book, Bishop Cosin directed the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for Quinquagesima Sunday to serve only until Ash Wednesday:—"Quinquagesima. [After the Gospel

is added (*manu Sancroft*):—This Collect, Epistle, and Gospel shall serve till the Wednesday following]. Ash Wednesday. ¶ And this Collect (with the Epistle and Gospel following) shall serve until the Sunday following. . . .”¹ In regard to the direction, cited above, that “the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel appointed for the Sunday shall serve all the week after . . . ,” the main purpose of the direction appears to be to provide for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist on week-days, rather than to forbid the use of any other Collect, Epistle, and Gospel.²

It is not inappropriate to call attention to the well-known fact that anciently Lent was not considered to have begun till the First Sunday in Lent, and that the addition of Ash Wednesday and the three following days to the Lenten fast is of comparatively modern introduction. In the West, for some centuries, Lent did not begin till the First Sunday in Lent.

¹ *Bishop Cosin's Correspondence*, II. 49, 50. Surtees Soc., Vol. LV.

² This is the view taken by the authors of *Ritual Conformity*, 4th ed. 1891; Parker, p. 4.

Dr. Wickham Legg¹ has pointed out that this still remains the custom in the Ambrosian rite, and it has left its mark on the breviaries of Western Dioceses, where the Lenten hymns do not begin to be sung until the First Sunday in Lent. The first mention of fasting does not occur, as we should have expected, in the Collect for Ash Wednesday, but in that for the following Sunday. This, again, points to the same conclusion—that the first four days of the modern Lent are an addition to the Lenten season, in order to make the more ancient number of thirty-six days of fasting to become forty. In treating of this subject Dr. Neale wrote :—

“It is rather wonderful, that the Collect for the First Sunday in Lent was not transposed with this (Collect for Ash Wednesday). At the same time, it shows the most venerable antiquity of these compositions, that fasting should be for the first time mentioned, not on the Wednesday, but on the Sunday; the four extra days being, as every one knows, of comparatively modern introduction.”²

Taking all things into consideration, I consider that the use of the Collect, Epistle, and

¹ *The Oxford Kalendar*, 1906. February sheet.

² J. M. Neale, *Essays on Liturgiology*, Lond., 1863 ; 55.

Gospel for Quinquagesima Sunday on the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday before the First Sunday in Lent is to be commended as right and proper, the Collect for Ash Wednesday being added as a second Collect, as directed in the rubric.

II. In regard to the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel to be used on the Friday and Saturday after Ascension day, it may be urged that the direction already quoted, "the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel appointed for the Sunday shall serve all the week after . . ." points to the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for Rogation Sunday as proper to be used. But against this stands the fact that the proper Preface for Ascension day is appointed to be used on the following Friday and Saturday. This fact seems to settle the question decisively, and to forbid the going back from the Ascension season to the Rogation season preceding it. The appointment of octaves by the use of proper Prefaces is quite unmistakably definite, and nothing should interfere therewith. To return to the previous season's

special liturgical features, in the case under discussion, would constitute a striking interference with such an arrangement, and a plain inconsistency of usage, which is not the case in regard to the days preceding the First Sunday in Lent.

Bishop Cosin ruled as follows :—"Ascension Day. [After the Gospel is inserted (*manu Sancroft*) :—This Collect, Epistle, and Gospel shall serve to the Sunday following]." ¹ It will be here noticed that Cosin follows consistently the line he took in regard to the special liturgical features of the three days following Ash Wednesday. Moreover, it is to be remembered that his wish to appoint a special Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the three Rogation days would have made it inappropriate to have returned to the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel of Rogation Sunday. Also, after the Epistle for the Fifth Sunday after Easter—Rogation Sunday—the following note is added to his MS. in Sancroft's hand :—"This Collect, Epistle, and Gospell shall be used only upon this day." ² Bishop Cosin's Collect for the Rogation Days

¹ *Bishop Cosin's Correspondence*, II. 51.

² *Ibid.*, II. 50.

is a very fine composition. After the preliminary rubric it runs thus :—

Between the Fifth Sunday after Easter and Ascension Day the following insertion is made :—
¶ The Rogation Dayes. The Collect. Almighty God, Lord of heaven and earth, in whom wee live and move and have our being ; who dost good unto all men, making thy sunne to rise on the evill and on the good, and sending raine on the just and on the unjust, Favourably behold us thy people, who call upon thy Name, and send us thy blessing from heaven in giving us fruitfull seasons and filling our hearts with food and gladnes, that both our hearts and mouths may be continually filled with thy praises, giving thanks to thee in thy holy Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Epistle. S. James v. 15–19.

The Gospel. S. Luke xi. 1–11.¹

If we consult pre-Reformation precedent, we find that the Sarum Missal orders the Ascension day Mass to be repeated on week-days during the octave. In the case of the Friday and Saturday after the Ascension day, I consider that the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel of that day should be used on the

¹ *Bishop Cosin's Correspondence*, II. 50.

two succeeding days, following English pre-Reformation precedent, and the suggestion made by the appointment of the proper Preface during the Ascensiontide octave, according to the Book of Common Prayer. In both the instances so far referred to the decision arrived at is in accordance with that of the authors of *Ritual Conformity*,¹ a work of great value.

III. In regard to the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel to be used on such week-days as may happen to intervene between the Epiphany and the first Sunday after that festival, there is no direction given in the Book of Common Prayer. The general rule that on all week-days for which no proper Collect, Epistle, and Gospel are appointed, the Collect, etc., of the previous Sunday shall serve, does not, strictly speaking, help us here; because no Collect, Epistle, and Gospel are provided for the Sunday (should there be one) between the Circumcision and the Epiphany—the Sunday is to borrow from the Circumcision. Cosin, to whom the Prayer Book owes so much, and who was an acute

¹ P. 4.

critic of its imperfections, pointed out this omission, so far as the Collect is concerned. He wrote :—" If the Epiphany shall fall upon Monday or Tuesday, etc., what Collect must be used for all the days of the week after ? It is a great incongruity to use the Collect of the Circumcision after the Epiphany is past. Therefore there wanteth an order here either to continue the Collect of the Epiphany all the days of the week following, or to make a new Collect for the Sunday before"¹ Now in writing thus, Bishop Cosin had evidently in mind the general rule referred to above, on which is founded the rubric which follows the Gospel for the Circumcision :—" The same Collect, Epistle, and Gospel shall serve for every day after unto the Epiphany." If Bishop Cosin wrote the words just quoted before the revision of 1661, which seems probable,² he would have in mind this rubric in its earlier form in the current 1604 Prayer-book :—" If there be a Sunday between the Epiphany and the Circumcision, then shall be used the same

¹ *Bishop Cosin's Works*, V. 510. Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.

² *Ibid.*, 502 note.

Collect, Epistle, and Gospel at the Communion, which was used upon the day of Circumcision."

A rigid conformity to the general rule that the Sunday Collect, etc., shall serve for ordinary succeeding week-days would result in the use of the special liturgical features of the Circumcision after the Epiphany—a proceeding manifestly inappropriate and involving a confusion of sequence in the commemorating events of the Sacred Infancy out of due chronological order.¹ And not only so, but in the case before us, should the Epiphany fall on a Monday, the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the Circumcision would be used daily (January 6th excepted) from January 1st to 11th; thus not only inverting the relative importance of the festival of the Circumcision and the season of Epiphany, but giving the Circumcision a duration of observance accorded to no other commemoration of the Christian year.

To return to Cosin's counsel. In the course

¹ I. Gregory Smith, M.A., *Epitome of the Life of our Blessed Saviour*, Rivingtons, 1867; p. 14. The objection raised above does not apply to the use of the liturgical features of Quinquagesima Sunday after Ash Wednesday—no event in our Lord's life being commemorated on the former day.

of the alterations which he proposed for adoption at the revision in 1661 we find :—"After the Gospel for the Epiphany is added :—and the same Collect, Epistle, and Gospel shall serve till the Sunday next following."¹

This advice is in accordance with the rubric of the Sarum Missal, which directed :—"The same Mass (that for the Epiphany) is said daily through the octave without Creed or Sequence;" to which is added :—"The service for Sunday in octave all as on the day, except Sequence and Gospel." We conclude, then, that, the general rule notwithstanding, it is fitting to continue the use of the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel appointed for the Epiphany until the Sunday following.

IV. To make the foregoing article more complete, something should perhaps be said about the liturgical features of any days which may happen to intervene between Holy Innocents' day and the First Sunday after Christmas. The rubric following the Collect for St. Stephen's day directs that "the Collect of the

¹ *Bishop Cosin's Correspondence*, II. 49.

Nativity shall be said continually until New Year's Eve." I do not think it open to doubt that the Epistle and Gospel for the Nativity are likewise intended for use on any days intervening between the Innocents' day and the Sunday following. Moreover, the appointment of the Proper Preface of Christmas day, to be used "seven days after," is surely indication enough, that the Christmas commemoration is to be paramount until the festival of the Circumcision. To use the special liturgical features of the Fourth Sunday in Advent (as a rigorous application of the general rubric requires) after the expiration of the Advent season, would surely be a striking anomaly, only parallel to using the Collect for Palm Sunday during Eastertide. I do not think that any such violent interference with the liturgical sequence of the Christian year was ever contemplated.

In the event of any revision of the rubrical directions of the Book of Common Prayer being made, the general rule—"The Collect, Epistle, and Gospel appointed for the Sunday shall serve all the week after, where it is not in this

Book otherwise ordered"—needs a certain amount of modification in three of the four cases discussed above, in the interests of liturgical propriety in maintaining the connected and uninterrupted sequence of the commemorations to which allusion has been made.

SUMMARY.

OCCASION.	COLLECT, EPISTLE, GOSPEL.
December 29th to 1st Sunday after Christmas.	Christmas Day.
January 7th to 1st Sunday after the Epiphany.	The Epiphany.
Thursday, Friday, Saturday after Ash Wednesday.	Quinquagesima, with Ash Wednesday Collect added.
Friday, Saturday after Ascension Day.	Ascension Day.

XI

THE OCCASIONAL PRAYERS

THE question has been raised as to when and how often the "Collect or Prayer for all Conditions of Men," and the "General Thanksgiving," are to be said in the recitation of Divine Service—that is, at Morning and Evening Prayer.

1. In the first place, the fact that neither of these two forms are found in "The Order for Morning or Evening Prayer daily throughout the Year," but are printed apart, amongst the occasional prayers, under the heading, "Prayers and Thanksgivings upon Several Occasions," suggests that they are not to be regarded as an unvarying part of Divine Service daily throughout the year—in other words, that it is not intended that they should be said daily at Morning and Evening Prayer without

intermission or exception, but occasionally. The rubric which governs the "Prayers and Thanksgivings upon Several Occasions" directs that they "be used before the two final prayers of the Litany, or of Morning and Evening Prayer." From a glance at the prayers which follow, it is evident that this direction cannot be held to imply that all the forms referred to are to be used every day; but that "upon the several occasions"—*e.g.*, during drought, in time of war, at Ember-tide, or during the session of Parliament—when any of these prayers are appropriate or specially ordered, they are "to be used before the two final prayers of the Litany, or of Morning and Evening Prayer." The rubric obviously relates merely to position, not to frequency of recitation. If it had been intended that the Prayer for all Conditions of Men and the General Thanksgiving should be said twice daily without variation, as an integral part of Morning and Evening Prayer, they would naturally have been printed in each case before the Prayer of St. Chrysostom, and not relegated to a place under the heading "Prayers and Thanksgivings upon Several

Occasions." It may possibly be urged that, in order to save space and to avoid repetition, these two forms are not printed twice in the daily Choir Offices ; but, against such a plea, it is to be observed that quite half of the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer is thus repeated in full—namely, all the introductory portion, which concludes with the response, "The Lord's Name be praised," from the Creed to the Collect for the day, and all the prayers which follow the Third Collect. Moreover, the exclusion of the two forms in question from the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer appears to have been deliberate. For, at the last revision, in 1662, the prayers for the king, the royal family, the clergy and people, together with the prayer of St. Chrysostom and the Benediction, were printed in the Order both for Morning and Evening Prayer, instead of being left, as previously, at the end of the Litany ; also Evening Prayer, which before began at the Lord's Prayer, was printed with the sentences, exhortation, confession, and absolution as at Morning Prayer. From these facts it is obvious that there was

in 1662 no idea of saving space or avoiding repetition, but quite the contrary idea. And it is particularly to be observed that it was in this very year, at the same revision in which all this repetition was deliberately adopted, that the Prayer for all Conditions of Men, and the General Thanksgiving, first appeared in the Prayer Book. From the circumstances of the revision just alluded to, and the position which was then assigned to these two forms in the Prayer Book, it appears highly probable, if not certain, that they were and are intended for more or less occasional use—upon “several occasions,” as distinguished from “all occasions.”

2. In regard to the Prayer for all Conditions of Men, the rubric directs that it “be used at such times when the Litany is not appointed to be said;” that is to say, the prayer is to be regarded and used as an alternative or substitute for the Litany, and not otherwise. A glance at its contents shows it to be a brief summary of a considerable portion of the petitions of the Litany; it is, in fact, the Litany condensed. Now, the Litany

is distinctly a morning and not an evening devotion. To say the Litany in the afternoon or the evening is to destroy the liturgical sequence of the morning services, which is, Mattins, Litany, and Holy Communion. In fact, the position assigned to the Litany in the Prayer Book affords a strong argument against afternoon or evening celebrations of the Holy Communion. The rubrics which govern the recitation of the Litany are as follows:—(1) “Here followeth the Litany, or General Supplication, to be sung, or said after Morning Prayer, upon Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays.” (2) Before the Prayer for the King at Morning Prayer only, “Then these five prayers following are to be read here, except when the Litany is read.” No such direction appears in the Order for Evening Prayer. (3) At the commencement of the Communion Service is the rubric, “After Morning Prayer, the Litany ended . . .” (4) In the Ordinal we find directions for the recitation of the Litany “after Morning Prayer is ended.” From these rubrics it is abundantly clear that the Litany is to be used in the morning

only, and that on the mornings of Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. On the remaining mornings of the week—*i.e.*, on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays—the Prayer for all Conditions of Men is to be said as the substitute for the Litany. Hence, this prayer, like its alternative the Litany, is a morning and not an evening devotion. There is nothing in the Prayer Book to suggest that it is ever to be used in the Evening Service. That this is the case is confirmed by the fact that Dr. Bisse,¹ writing in 1716, that is, but fifty-four years after the Prayer first appeared in the Prayer Book, states :—

“This Collect was added at the last review : for before our Church used no general intercession, but in the Litany and in the Prayer for the Church Militant, that is, on fasting-days, or at the Communion, at which times these intercessions were most likely to prevail. However, upon the complaint of the Dissenters, who thought our Liturgy deficient for want of such a form of daily intercession . . . to satisfy all complaints, this Prayer was added to supply the place of the

¹ Dr. Bisse, *The Beauty of Holiness in the Common Prayer, as set forth in Four Sermons preached at the Rolls Chapel in the year 1716*. Seventh Edition, 1720 ; p. 97, note.

Litany: and, for this reason, is to be 'used at such times, when the Litany is not appointed to be said.' And therefore Bishop Gunning,¹ the supposed author of it, in the College whereof he was head, suffered it not to be read in the afternoon, because the Litany was never read then, the place of which it was supposed to supply."

The Rev. John Jebb in like manner says:—

"The prayer for all conditions of men (is) to be read on the four days in the week when the Litany is not appointed to be said . . . the prayer is merely a substitute for the Litany, which was never intended to be read after the third Collect of Evening Prayer. It might just as properly be read in the course of the Communion Service."²

The Prayer for all Conditions of Men cannot be said in the Evening Prayer without disregard of the rubrics. At the least, to use it at Evening Prayer is to exceed the directions of the Prayer Book, and to make an unauthorized addition to that Office.

3. In regard to the General Thanksgiving. The position of this form amongst a collection

¹ On Bp. Gunning's zeal for the observance of the rubrics, see "*The Remains of Denis Granville*," Surtees Soc., vol. xlvii. Pt. ii., p. 108.

² *The Choral Service, etc.*, Lond., 1843; p. 399.

of prayers and thanksgivings, not one of which is to be said daily throughout the year, clearly implies that it, too, is to be regarded similarly as an occasional devotion. In other words, if the General Thanksgiving is to be said every day, how comes it to occupy a position amongst a set of forms for occasional use only? Upon the use of this form, Jebb remarks:—

“No rubric whatever enjoins its use (as an unvarying portion of Morning and Evening Prayer). In fact, it interrupts the order of the Service.”¹

It is a thanksgiving for blessings in general, one of the thanksgivings upon “several occasions” as contrasted with “all occasions.” If said twice daily throughout the year, it not only ceases to be an occasional devotion, but it also loses its point. It would be well, the writer thinks, if it were reserved for use upon special occasions, as, for example, at Morning and Evening Prayer on all Sundays and festivals. Its omission on ferial days and fasting days is in accordance with its position in the Prayer Book ; though it might be said with its marginal

¹ *The Choral Service, etc.*, p. 400.

addition on any day, without distinction, when any person is present who desires to return thanks for mercies received.

Many of the clergy, in their praiseworthy desire to recite the Choir Offices whole and undefiled, have been accustomed to say both the Prayer for all Conditions of Men and the General Thanksgiving daily at Evening Prayer; but such a use, in the light of what has been said above, appears to be a work of supererogation. There is no more authority for adding to the Choir Offices than there is for subtracting from them. In favour of the suggestions here made for the occasional or less frequent use of both the forms in question, it may be urged that such a limited use would be not only reasonable, but that it would also give a desirable variety in the recitation of the daily Offices of the Church, based upon intelligent conformity to the directions or suggestions of the Book of Common Prayer.

XII

ON CERTAIN EUCHARISTIC "AMENS"

It is the purpose of the following article to offer some remarks concerning two matters of ritual connected with the Holy Eucharist, which, in the most rigorous sense of the term, may be described as "Catholic usages"—namely, (1) The *Amen* of the people after the Consecration of the Elements; (2) The Communicant's *Amen* at the Reception of the same. Both these customs are most ancient, widespread, and common to all Christians; and therefore they are conspicuously Catholic usages, and as such are worthy of attention.

I.—THE AMEN AFTER THE CONSECRATION

That the Eucharist, viewed as a sacrifice and as a feast, is a service of Divine

appointment in which the whole Christian body is concerned, represents a truth which, in our own day, is being more and more acknowledged and realized. The Sacrifice is the sacrifice of the whole Christian society: the Communion is the communion of the whole body. "No priest says 'I offer,' but 'we offer,' in the person of the whole Church."¹ The language of the early liturgies is "*We offer.*" In the Canon of the Roman Missal, we find, "*offerimus,*" "*meam ac vestrum sacrificium,*" "*oblationem . . . cunctæ familiæ tuæ.*" And such language as this finds its origin in the words of St. Paul—"The cup of blessing which *we* bless . . . the bread which *we* break."² Teaching of very considerable importance upon this subject is contained in the same Apostle's words, in which he is urging the appropriateness of the use of a language understood of the worshippers—"Else if thou bless (εὐλογῆσης) with the spirit, how shall he that filleth the place of the unlearned say the Amen at thy giving of thanks (εὐχαριστία), seeing he

¹ Peter Lombard, *Sentt.* iv., 13.

² 1 Cor. x., 16.

knoweth not what thou sayest?"¹ From a comparison of these words with those in which our Lord's institution of the Eucharist is recorded—"And as they were eating, He took bread, and when He had blessed (εὐλογήσας), He brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take ye: this is my body: And He took a cup, and when He had given thanks (εὐχαριστήσας), He gave to them: and they all drank of it: And He said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant. . ."²—from such a comparison, it is evident that St. Paul is referring to the celebration of the Eucharist. Bishop Chr. Wordsworth, following the Fathers, explains St. Paul's words similarly:—"If thou shalt bless, etc.—i.e., if thou shalt say the prayer of Benediction, in the Holy Communion, in a foreign language, how shall he, who is a layman, be able to say the *Amen* at thy Consecration of the Elements?"³ Dionysius of Alexandria, speaking of one who had never

¹ 1 Cor. xiv., 16.

² St. Mark xiv., 22 ff.

³ On 1 Cor. xiv., 16. For patristic interpretation, see Hickes, *Treatises*, ii., 213 and note; also *Ibid.* iii., 417 and note. Lib. A. C. Theol.

been truly baptized, but had frequently, notwithstanding, received the Eucharist, says that it was not thought good to rebaptize him, since he had for a long time heard the Thanksgiving (*εὐχαρίστια*), joined with the people in the common *Amen*, stood by the Table, stretched forth his hands to receive the Holy Food and received it, had partaken of the Body and Blood of Christ.¹ St. Chrysostom, in commenting on St. Paul's words, likewise refers to the same custom. He says that if the layman does not hear the words, *world without end*, which close the Thanksgiving, he cannot respond *Amen*.² Upon which Bingham says:—"Where we may observe, both that the Consecration Prayer ended with a known Doxology to the Holy Trinity, whereof those words, *world without end*, were a part; and that the people hearing them answered, *Amen*."³ In the sixth century the Emperor Justinian ordered that the consecration formula should be said aloud, expressly on the ground that the

¹ Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.*, vii. 9. "Εὐχαριστίας γὰρ ἐπακούσαντα, καὶ συνεπιθεγγόμενον τὸ ἄμην. . . ."

² Chrysos., *Homil.* 35, in 1 Cor., p. 640.

³ *Antiquit. of the Christian Church*, xv. iii. sec. 25.

people might respond *Amen* at its close.¹ For an earlier authority, we consult the account given by Justin Martyr, in the middle of the second century, to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, of the celebration of the Eucharist by the primitive Christians, in the course of which we read :—" . . . when the president has ended the prayers and thanksgiving (Eucharist) the whole assistant people assent with an *Amen* ; a Hebrew word meaning *so be it*." And, later, ". . . bread is produced, and wine and water, and the president offers up prayers and thanksgivings, according to his power ; and the people assent with the *Amen*, and the distribution and participation, by each of the blessed food takes place."² It is to be observed that Justin Martyr gives the reason for the people's response of *Amen*, namely, by way of " assent " to the words and action of the celebrant.

In the face of this array of clear evidence to the Scriptural and historical custom under discussion, it is almost incredible that in the Communion Service of the Book of Common

¹ *Novella* 123, in Migne's *Patrol.*, tom. 72, p. 1026.

² *Apol.*, i., 65-6.

Prayer of 1552, 1559, and 1604, the *Amen* at the close of the Prayer of Consecration is omitted! It was happily restored at the revision of 1661, being printed in the Sealed Books in a different type from that used for the Prayer of which it is the conclusion. Its omission for more than 100 years—*i.e.*, from 1552 till 1661—is the more remarkable, when we remember that one of the leading principles of the Reformers was to restore to the people their legitimate share in the Services of the Church, and very specially in the supreme act of Christian worship; which, as Mr. Simmons has pointed out in his notes on *The Lay Folks' Mass Book*, had in the Middle Ages tended more and more to become an exclusively clerical service. His words are—"we know that for years before the Reformation neither the unlearned, nor—unless they were members of a religious foundation, or were in minor orders,—those 'who of the letter could,' had taken any audible part in the service when they 'heard mass,' as their share in it very fittingly came to be called."¹ In the reign of

¹ *The Lay Folks' Mass Book*, E.E.T.S., xix., xx.

Queen Mary I., a learned and temperate apologist for the papal system urged that, instead of its being an advantage to the people to understand the public service of the Church, it was rather a hindrance, interfering with their private devotions. Johannes Andreas, the great authority on the Canon Law, writing in the earlier half of the fourteenth century, had already given, as one of the reasons why the Canon should be said by the celebrant in silence, *ne impediatur populus orare*.¹ Mr. Cuthbert Atchley has likewise drawn attention, in his recently published commentary on *Ordo Romanus Primus*,² to the gradual elimination, under papal influence, of the people's active share in the Eucharistic service, which formed so prominent a feature in the early liturgies. Thus it will be readily acknowledged that the very serious omission of the *Amen*, by which the people testified their assent to, and their participation in the celebrant's act of consecration

¹ Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, Lib. i. tit. 10. *De officio Archidiaconi*.

² *Library of Liturgiology and Ecclesiology*, De La More Press, 1905; pp. 5, 65, 66.

and offering, was rightly supplied by the fathers in 1661, in adding the people's *Amen* at the close of the Prayer of Consecration. And it is very greatly to be desired that the laity should intelligently claim their lay priesthood, and exercise it by audibly answering *Amen* at the termination of the Canon. The feebleness and well-nigh inaudible character of the response made by the laity at this point of the service, in our own day, seems to imply a failure to realise both its supreme importance and their own high privilege. I have before me a manual of private devotions, in which this direction is given at the end of the Prayer of Consecration—"Be careful to say *Amen* at the end of the Consecration Prayer, and so join in the action of the priest."¹ And I venture to think that the clergy, especially in preparing young persons and others for first Communion, would do well in drawing attention to St. Paul's words concerning "the *Amen*" at the Eucharist. The great privilege of having the service in the mother tongue carries with it a corresponding responsibility in the way of

¹ *Christian Duty*, Mowbrays, Oxford, 1903 ; pp. 105, 133.

intelligent co-operation on the part of the communicants.

It is interesting to observe that stress was laid by the Nonjurors upon the people responding *Amen* in the midst, or at the conclusion, of the Canon. These men were considerably in advance of their times in liturgical matters. In the Nonjurors' Communion Service of 1718, after the words "This is My Body . . . in remembrance of Me," is interpolated, "*Here the people shall answer, Amen*"; and the direction is repeated after the words, "This is My Blood . . . in remembrance of Me." Again, in Thomas Deacon's "Holy Liturgy" of 1734, at the conclusion of the Canon is found the direction, "*And all the people shall say with a loud voice, Amen.*"

II.—AMEN AFTER THE COMMUNION

There is, however, another use of the answer *Amen*, in connexion with the Eucharist, of which I would speak—*i.e.*, the communicant's response to the words of administration. Though no Scriptural allusion in its favour,

as in the case of the Canon, can be produced, yet, nevertheless, the custom of each communicant saying *Amen* to the priest's formula of administration is very ancient and widespread.¹ In the third century Canons of Hippolytus (A.D. 220), the form of administration was, "This is the Body of Christ," and "This is the Blood of Christ": in each case the communicant answered, *Amen*. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who wrote A.D. 347 or 348, refers to the custom, "... having hallowed thy palm, receive the body of Christ, saying after it, *Amen* . . . approach also to the cup of His blood . . . and saying in the way of worship and reverence, *Amen*."² In the recently discovered *The Testament of our Lord*, which is dated A.D. 350, there is a double *Amen* said by the communicant after receiving the cup, typical of the Body and Blood of Christ—"When he taketh of the Cup, let him say twice *Amen*, for a complete symbol of the Body and Blood."

¹ "Cet *Amen* après la communion sous l'une et l'autre espèce est une profession de foi qui remonte à la plus haute antiquité."—F. Cabrol, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, sub *Amen*, col. 1560.

² *Cate. Lect.*, xxiii., 21, 22. Lib. of Fathers.

And again, "Let him who giveth the sacrament say: 'The Body of Jesus Christ . . .,' and let him who receiveth say: *Amen*."¹ In the later Apostolic Constitutions, A.D. 375, we find—"Let the Bishop minister the Oblation, saying, *The Body of Christ*, and let him that receiveth say, *Amen*," and similarly with the reception of the cup.² In the First Series of Notes on the Book of Common Prayer, frequently attributed, though incorrectly, to Bishop Cosin, and printed along with his comments on the Prayer Book,³ occur the following words:—

The Body of our Lord, etc. . . . unto everlasting life. Here are the people to answer *Amen*, according to all ancient and modern liturgies. From whence we gather, that the priest did not deliver the Sacrament to any, or say, "Take and eat," before the communicants had professed their faith in Christ's Body to be exhibited unto them. *Dicit tibi sacerdos, Corpus Christi, et tu dicis Amen, hoc est, Verum; non otiose dicis Amen, sed jam confitens, quod accipias Corpus*

¹ *The Testament of our Lord*, ed. Cooper and Maclean, Edin., 1902; pp. 77, 128.

² viii., 14, § 3.

³ Cosin's *Works*, V. 112, 113. Lib. Anglo. Cath. Theol. The First Series of Notes, printed in Vol. V. of Cosin's *Works*, was most probably the work of Hayward, nephew of Bishop Overall.

Christi (Ambr. *de Sacr.* lib. iv., cap. 5). *Ex ore quo Amen in sanctum protuleris* (Tertull. *de Spect.* cap. 26): *Qua conscientia ad Eucharistiam Christi accedam, et respondebo Amen, cum de charitate dubitem porrigentis* (Hieron. *Epist.* 82. *ad Theophilum*, sec. 2, Op. tom. i., col. 510, A.). Out of which words it is plain, that when the priest reached it the people answered Amen, or, So it is. To which also divers divines apply that of St. Paul, 1 ad Cor. cap. 14: *Quomodo respondebit Amen super tuam Eucharistiam?* . . . So Leo, *Serm.* 6, *de jejuniis Sept. Mens.* (*Serm.* xci., cap. 3. Op. tom. i. col. 357), *Hoc ore sumitur quod fide creditur, et frustra ab illis Amen respondetur, a quibus contra id quod sumitur disputatur.*

Body, etc. . . . Blood of our Lord, etc. . . . unto everlasting life. To this prayer of the priest every communicant should say *Amen*; and then, and not before, take the Sacrament of him. *Universam ecclesiam, accepto Christi sanguine, dicere [Amen] asserit* Aug. *ad Orosium*, *quæst.* 49. *Quare duo hic egregia habemus.* 1. *Universam ecclesiam participem esse calicis*; et 2. *Cum accipiant et dicere, Amen.*

In Bishop Andrewes' *Notes on the Prayer Book*, we read: "*The Blood . . . unto everlasting life.* To this prayer of the priest every communicant should say *Amen*, and then, and not before, take the Sacrament of him."¹ In

¹ *Minor Works*, p. 157. Lib. A. C. Theol. See previous quotation.

the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, incorrectly called Archbishop Laud's Book, is the direction, after the administration in either kind, "Here the party receiving shall say, *Amen*." This direction is due to King Charles I.¹ Hamon L'Estrange² comments thus upon this rubric:—

Here the party receiving shall say, Amen. This order is a piece of reformation, wherein the Church of Scotland stands single and alone. I call it a piece of reformation, because it is the reviving of a very ancient custom. The same is the direction in the Constitutions ascribed to the Apostles. "Let the bishop give the oblation of bread, saying, The Body of Christ, and let him that receiveth it say, Amen. Then the deacon having the cup, and delivering it, let him say, The Blood of Christ, the cup of salvation; and let him that drinketh say, Amen" (Lib. viii. c. 13). By St. Augustine it should seem to have been of general usage, saying, "The universal Church at the receiving of the Blood of Christ, answereth, Amen." Thus you see upon what terms of conformity

¹ *Scottish Liturgy*, 1637; ed. J. Cooper, Edin., 1904; p. lx. "At the *Words of Distribution* the King deletes the second sentences which stood in the English book, *And take and eat or drink this in remembrance . . . thanks giving*, and adds the rubric, *Here the party receiving shall say Amen, as also after the receiving of the cup*."

² *The Alliance of Divine Offices*, Lond., 1690; vii. 324. Lib. A. C. Theol.

the Scotch service, in this particular, stands with the ancient practice (*Respons. ad quaest. Orosii*, 49).

In 1638, Bishop Montague asked in his Visitation Articles for the diocese of Norwich, "Doth he deliver bread and cup, severally to each communicant . . . using the words, *The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee: The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee?* At pronounciation of which words directed unto them, each several communicant was wont in the Primitive Church to say, Amen, as professing his consent unto, and approbation of the truth thereof."¹ Bishop Cosin, to whom the addition of the *Amen* at the close of the Canon appears to have been due,² desired that *Amen* should be inserted in the midst of the words of administration, after the words, "body and soul unto everlasting life, *Amen*," at the revision of 1661; but unfortunately, his suggestion was not adopted.³

¹ Tit., 7, 10.

² Bp. Cosin's *Correspondence*, ii. 58, Surtees Soc., 1870.

³ Ibid. 59. See Cosin's *Collection of Private Devotions*, A.D. 1627; *Works*, ii. 275. Ibid. v. 517n. Lib. A. C. Theol.; also Bp. Wren's suggestion in Jacobson's *Fragmentary Illustrations of Hist. of B. C. P.*, pp. 82-83.

That it was not adopted is perplexing, when we remember the terms of King Charles II.'s warrant for the Conference at the Savoy for the revision of the Prayer Book in 1661—"to advise upon and review the said Book of Common Prayer, comparing the same with the most ancient Liturgies which have been used in the Church, in the primitive and purest times."¹ Certainly, the communicant's Amen, at the reception of the Holy Communion, was a common feature of such liturgies.²

In Queen Anne's reign the ancient practice continued in the Church of England, as is evidenced by the following passage—"Why do the Communicants usually answer *Amen*, as soon as the Minister has said these words (*The Body of Christ*, etc.)? The Communicants answer *Amen* at the end of these words, to profess thereby their faith of the mysterious Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament."³ *The New Week's Preparation*, a

¹ Cardwell, *Hist. of Conferences*, vii. 300.

² "This response was the universal practice of the early Church."—Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, 2nd ed., 748.

³ Edward Creffield, *A Catechistical Explanation of the*

famous book of devotion of the early years of the eighteenth century, contains the direction to say, after the words, "everlasting life" at the administration—"be sure you say softly a most hearty Amen . . . be sure you say, in heart, Amen."¹ It will be observed that the *Amen* is directed to be said in the midst of the words of administration, in accordance with old tradition, and not at the close of the newly added, "Take and eat. . . . Drink this. . . ." Similarly, Bishop Wilson, in his *Short and Plain Instruction to . . . The Lord's Supper*,² adds *Amen* at the reception of each Element in his Directions and Devotions for communicants, in the same position.

In the Scottish Liturgy, now in use in the Scottish Church, the *textus receptus* of which is the edition of 1764, after the words of administration, which in each case terminate with "preserve thy soul and body unto everlasting life," follows the direction, "*Here the person receiving*

Dayly and Sunday Offices and Rubricks of the Common Prayer, Lond., S. Keble, 1713; p. 85.

¹ *The New Week's Preparation for a Worthy Receiving of the Lord's Supper*, no date, Lond., 112, 113.

² Bp. Wilson's *Works*, iv. 406, Lib. A. C. Theol.

shall say, Amen."¹ The present Bishop of Moray, in his recent Primary Charge, has happily drawn attention to this feature of the noble Scottish Rite, and to its unfortunate omission from the English Rite :—

The Communicant's "Amen." Our Scottish Liturgy expressly bids the communicants to say *Amen* before receiving. This is one of the most ancient features of the service, and I think we should encourage our communicants to make this audible response. When the English Communion Service is used, the *Amen* should be said after "everlasting life," and not at the end of the formula of administration.²

In any future revision of the Communion Service of the Book of Common Prayer, it is reasonably to be expected that the *Amen* of the communicants at the reception will be restored, in accordance with primitive and universal custom.

The Amen said by the people at the conclusion of the Canon, and the *Amen* said by the communicants at the reception of the Elements, are alike to be regarded as matters

¹ Dowden, *The Annotated Scottish Communion Office*, p. 21.

² *A Charge delivered at the Diocesan Synod of Moray, etc.*, Dumfries, 1905 ; p. 28.

of quite extraordinary importance : (A) as being the worshippers' assent to the consecration of the Elements and the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice—an assent which St. Paul takes for granted that they will intelligently give to the sacrificial action of the priest, who stands at the altar as their representative ; (B) as an acknowledgment of belief in the Sacramental Presence of Jesus Christ in the consecrated Elements, and the appropriation by faith of the virtue of the Sacrament.

For the antiquities of the subject of the Eucharistic *Amens* treated above, to which reference is not made in this article, see Smith and Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, Vol. I., pp. 413 ff., *sub* Communion, Holy ; *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, publié par Le R. P. dom Fernand Cabrol, Paris, 1904, Fasc. vi., col. 1556, *Amen après la Consécration* ; col. 1560, *L'Amen après la Communion* ; also Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, 2nd ed., pp. 565–9, 635, 636, 748, 755, 756 ; Hastings, *A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, *sub* Amen, p. 51.

XIII

PRAYER-BOOK REVISION

THE CONVOCATION PRAYER-BOOK ¹

IN this volume we find the current edition of the Book of Common Prayer, interleaved with tinted paper on which are printed all the alterations recommended by the Convocations of the two Provinces, or by one or other of them, in their respective Reports addressed to the Crown in reply to Letters of Business issued by the Crown in the year 1879. The sub-title of the volume is, *The Convocation Prayer-book, with Altered Rubrics, showing what would be the condition of the Book if amended in conformity with the recommendations of the Convocations of Canterbury and York, contained in Reports presented to her Majesty the Queen in the year 1879.* The

¹ New Edition. John Murray, 1907.

recommendations set forth in "The Convocation Prayer-book" represent the result of the fourth and final Report of the Ritual Commission, the Convocations having received Letters of Business authorising them to discuss and to report thereon.

As a result of the Report recently made by the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, Letters of Business similarly have been issued by the Crown to Convocation, empowering that body to take action in the way of making some suggestions for the readjustment or alteration of certain rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer. The purpose of such action is, it is understood, to reduce to order the confusion and diversity of use in matters of ceremonial and ritual at present prevailing in the Church, to which attention has been called in the Report of the Commissioners. "The Convocation Prayer-book," which first appeared in 1880, is evidently re-issued at this moment, at the instance of the publisher, in view of the coming discussions in Convocation. Its re-issue is significant, and demands attention. As it is expressly stated in the "Note to the Reader"

that the volume so amended possesses no kind of authority, as is the case, it is therefore open to full and free criticism. In fact, the gravity of the situation created by the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, and the knowledge that Convocation, in accordance with the instructions contained in the recently-issued Letters of Business, is about to discuss, and almost certainly to suggest some alterations in certain of the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, makes a thorough and serious criticism of the recommendations made in "The Convocation Prayer-book" of 1879 a duty owed to the Church; for it is pretty certain that this amended Book of 1879 will be consulted or referred to by Convocation in the coming session. If we are right in this forecast, we sincerely trust that the suggestions made therein will be closely scrutinised, forasmuch as they have in no wise been regarded with satisfaction, or even in some cases been considered to be amendments or improvements, by competent English liturgiologists and other careful and discriminating students of the Book of Common Prayer.

In support of this opinion, it is well to call attention to two facts. First, the recommendations made in the altered rubrics of "The Convocation Prayer-book" were very far from being unanimously adopted by both Convocations. The alterations suggested by the Convocation of Canterbury are frequently noted as amended or rejected by that of York; so frequently is this the case (we have counted more than fifty instances), that we are tempted to seek the reason for this conspicuous divergence of opinion upon certain points. It seems probable that it is to be attributed to the fact that the Northern Convocation had the advantage, unshared by the Southern Convocation, of the presence during its discussions of an eminent liturgical scholar—the Rev. T. F. Simmons, Canon of York—who, in the very year in which the Convocations issued their recommendations embodied in "The Convocation Prayer-book" had completed and published his most scholarly edition, with copious annotations, of "The Lay Folks Mass Book, and Offices in English according to the Use of York," for the Early English Tract Society

(London, 1879). The divergence of opinion, we repeat, is very remarkable, as evidenced in the added notes of "The Convocation Prayer-book." Secondly, the suggested alterations or supposed amendments were made nearly thirty years ago, and they belong to a past age of liturgical knowledge—an age when the knowledge of the science of liturgy among Anglicans was very imperfect and very partial, not to say erroneous in many respects. Some conspicuous instances confront us in "The Convocation Prayer-book" in support of this estimate, to which reference will be made later. Doubtless the revisers of 1879 were in earnest, and did their best according to their light—but their light was dim, and in not a few cases they acted upon imperfect and untrustworthy information. That such was the case there is no difficulty in showing when we come to details.

Even in our own day a very large proportion of the Bishops and Presbyters, through no fault of their own, are still under the same influences—as the results of lack of time and opportunity to study liturgiology, early training,

o

prevailing misconceptions, and inherited customs for which neither authority nor precedent can be claimed. An overwhelming majority of the members of Convocation are inadequately equipped to enter the liturgical or ceremonial arena. They do not profess to be competent or skilled liturgical scholars, and they have had no training to fit them for the most delicate and difficult task of liturgical revision. During the last thirty years some progress has, it is true, been made in the science of liturgy (and we include ritual and ceremonial, using the words in their proper sense under the term) as the result of long and laborious research, but as yet the new light is not widely diffused, it is the possession of the very few at the present time. English liturgiologists whose learning entitles them to be consulted and followed may be counted upon the fingers of both hands; among the clerical order they may probably be counted on the fingers of one hand. In this paucity of skilled scholars of the subject lies the extreme danger of any alteration by Convocation of the Prayer Book as it now stands. At no time during

the last two centuries has Convocation been adequately informed to consider and amend the rubrics or to compose new liturgical forms. Any attempts at the latter have hitherto proved dismal failures—the art is lost. It is no want of respect to say that Convocation to-day does not possess the requisite knowledge to take in hand any revision of rubrics or liturgical forms. Such a task, in the very order of things, can only be safely attempted by men who have made liturgiology, in its two divisions of ritual and ceremonial, a life-long study. And, to press the question, How many of the members of Convocations of the English Church have had the time to fit themselves for such a responsible task? And how many would venture to say they felt equal to undertake it? If Convocation resolves to make changes, would it not be the more prudent course to appoint a small Committee of clerics and laics who are acknowledged experts to report—men whose liturgical and ecclesiological attainments would give confidence in their decisions and suggestions?

We may now examine in detail some of the alterations recommended by the Convocations

of Canterbury and York. Broadly speaking, they may be classed under the two heads of undesirable and desirable alterations. To take the former first.

P. 6. The permission to use the Order of Morning Prayer, Litany and Holy Communion in varying sequence as separate services, would result in disturbing the traditional order of these Services. The permission to say the Litany at Evening Prayer after the third Collect is a violent innovation on English precedent. The rubrics which govern the Litany dwell with emphasis upon that intercession as a morning devotion, preparatory to the Eucharist, and as a solemn preparation for taking part in that Service. The Litany has been aptly described as "the Anglican Introit." Its immemorial connexion with the Eucharist considered, to say it in the evening would tend to prepare the way for celebrating the Eucharist in the evening, contrary to Catholic custom. A Service outside the Services provided in the Prayer Book, with a Sermon to be preceded by a Collect with or without the Lord's Prayer, is allowed. Now the important thing is the

Lord's Prayer, and not the Collect as is unfortunately suggested by the new rubric.

P. 6A. The permission in parish churches to shorten the Offices on ferial days, by omitting large and important portions of the Divine Service perpetuates the worst features of the Shortened Services Act of 1872—an Act which deals a deadly blow at the liturgical traditions of the English Church, and which, more than anything else, has led to the liturgical anarchy which at present prevails. The Shortened Services Act perpetuates one of the worst features of the pre-Reformation Church, namely, the reading of inconsequent scraps of Holy Scripture.¹

P. 11. The appointment of Proper Psalms for ten days, in addition to the six days so provided in the Book of Common Prayer is excessive; especially such a provision for Michaelmas and All Saints, which are alike festivals subordinate to the greater festivals of the Christian year. The tendency to exalt unduly the importance of All Saints day is

¹ See The Act of 1872, etc., in *Some Principles of the Prayer Book*, Rivingtons, 1899; pp. 130 ff.

again manifest on p. 253, where, contrary to English precedent (Sarum), it is suggested that the day be observed with an octave. To such a proposal the Convocation of York rightly objected.

P. 24A. In the Table of Occurrences, modern Roman use is followed, apparently in ignorance of old English use, in two cases—namely, in giving the Annunciation precedence over the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Sundays in Lent, thereby destroying the ancient sequence of the Sundays in Lent ; and in giving Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday in Holy Week precedence over the Annunciation. In these two instances the Convocation Table differs from the Sarum and the old Roman rules. Upon this point see the exhaustive article on “The Occurrence of Holy Days” in “The Guardian,” March 21st, 1906.¹ In the footnote we notice a strange objection to the reading of the Apocrypha. To the Table of Occurrences the York Convocation somewhat unreasonably objected altogether. It was a laudable attempt to give much-needed directions.

¹ See above, pp. 84 ff.

P. 32. The direction to the Minister on all occasions to wear "a surplice with a stole or scarf, and the hood of his degree," with the alternative of "a gown with hood and scarf" in preaching, takes the place of the Ornaments Rubric, which sanctions the use of the Eucharistic vestments. If by "stole or scarf" the same vesture is intended, the confusion is great; for they are distinct vestures, the stole being one of the Eucharistic vestments, whilst the scarf is the descendant of a choir vesture. Any alteration of the Ornaments Rubric was happily rejected by the York Convocation.

P. 36 (and p. 155), directs the substitution of the Easter Anthem for the *Venite* during the octave of Easter day. This is open to objection, the usage tending to obscure the history of the Paschal Anthem, which is an announcement of the Resurrection, and should be limited to Easter day. To use it oftener is to destroy its special meaning and value.¹

P. 62. The direction for the Litany to be said by "the Minister and people all kneeling,"

¹ See Dr. Legg's *Oxford Kalendar*, 1907, *sub* Monday in Easter Week, for a full account of the objection.

is, in the case of the Minister open to objection ; the proper posture for him to adopt from the Lord's Prayer to the conclusion is that of standing. The permission to omit the Litany altogether on Christmas day, Easter day, and Whitsunday, is distinctly bad, these days being occasions on which large numbers communicate—some of whom do not communicate on other occasions in the year—the previous penitential exercise of the Litany is specially appropriate in preparation for the reception of the Sacrament.

P. 172. The direction to add the Collect for Ascension day as a second Collect on the Sunday following that day is unnecessary, since the latter Collect contains sufficient allusion to the Ascension without further emphasis.

P. 247. The appointment of an octave to Michaelmas is contrary to old English precedent. There was no octave in the Sarum, York, and Hereford Missals.

P. 253. The assignment of an octave to All Saints is likewise, as said above, contrary to precedent.

P. 267. The permission for persons to leave

the church during the celebration of Holy Communion before the Prayer for the Church is a most serious matter, inasmuch as, amongst other objections, it contravenes the express order of Canon 18 of 1604, which directs "none, either man, woman, or child . . . shall depart out of the church during the time of service and sermon, without some urgent or reasonable cause." The permission is also at variance with the rubric before the Blessing—"Then the priest shall let them depart with this blessing," implying that no one is to depart before the conclusion of the service by the Benediction.

P. 280. The application of the term "Offertory" to the money given at the collection is grossly inaccurate. The term "Offertory" in the Prayer-book is never so used, but it signifies a certain essential portion of the Eucharistic Service—namely, that which includes the offering of money and other gifts, and of the elements, preparatory to the Canon. The suggested words, "When there is no Offertory," implies a possible omission marring the completeness of the Eucharistic Service, and would be paralleled by such words as,

"When there is no Epistle and Gospel," or "no Post-Communion." The York Convocation properly suggested "for 'Offertory,' read 'collection of alms and other devotions of the people.'" Collection, and not offertory, is the word used in the New Testament (1 Cor. xvi. 1) in describing the money given in church. Why attempt to improve upon it?

P. 307. In the Marriage Service, the leaving the use of the prayer, "O Merciful Lord, and Heavenly Father," to the minister's discretion is only embarrassing. The suggestion is not without significance in view of the declining birth-rate.

The more gracious task remains of calling attention to some good points in the alterations proposed in "The Convocation Prayer-book." Among desirable alterations may be mentioned—permission to use the Proper Psalms for Christmas day, Easter day, and the Ascension day on the Sunday in the octave of each feast named; the provision for other than the minister to read the Lessons; the addition of the explanatory note to the Athanasian Creed;

the appointment of the Litany on Rogation days; the appointment of the Christmas day Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for any week-days following Holy Innocents' till the Sunday after Christmas day; the appointment of the Epiphany Collect, Epistle, and Gospel until the Sunday after the Epiphany; the permission to sing an Introit to the Holy Communion Service; the authorisation of "Glory be to Thee, O Lord," before the liturgical Gospel; the direction to the reader of the Gospel and Epistle to turn himself to the people; the instruction to read one or other of the Exhortations at the Eucharist thrice a year at least; the permission to sing the Offertory sentences; the permission to ask the prayers of the congregation for the sick and others before the Prayer for the Church, and the addition in the same prayer of the words, when needed, "especially those for whom our prayers are desired;" the permission to say both the prayer of Oblation and the Thanksgiving at the Communion (this is a great gain from a liturgical point of view); the provision of a set of alternative interrogatories in the Confirmation Service for such candidates

as have no sponsors—a decided advantage, the present form not applying to such persons, and tending to unreality; the liberty to say in the church, if occasion require, more of the Burial Service than at present allowed—this would be a great boon to the clergy and mourners, and its authorisation would undoubtedly save some sickness, and probably not a few deaths, attributable to exposure to bad weather. From a liturgical point of view this last suggestion is good, the termination of the first part of the Burial Office at the end of the Lesson is exceedingly abrupt, and this is specially noticeable in cases where the grave is some distance from the church.

XIV

POSTURE OF THE MINISTER DURING THE READING OF THE COLLECTS

To the irreverence and profanity of the Puritans during the first half of the seventeenth century, and particularly during the time of the Great Rebellion, we owe not a few of the alterations and improvements made in the Book of Common Prayer at the last revision of that book in the year 1661. Amongst these we find certain alterations of and additions to the rubrics, made of set purpose to put an end to the unseemly custom, introduced by the Puritans, of sitting during the prayers and particularly at the reception of the Eucharist. An examination of the rubrics of 1661, compared with those of the Prayer Book of 1604, reveals the following cases :—

1. *Mattins* : the words “all kneeling” were added to the rubric before the Collects.
2. *Public Baptism* : the words “all

kneeling" were added to the rubric before the Our Father.

3. *Confirmation*: the rubric, "And (all kneeling down) the Bishop shall add," was introduced before the addition of the Our Father.

4. *Holy Communion*: in the rubric at the reception of the Elements, the "kneeling" of 1604, becomes in 1661, "all meekly kneeling."

It is the purpose of this article to draw attention to the first of these additions, contained in the rubric prefatory to the Collects. The question is being continually raised, What is the proper posture or position to be adopted by the Minister as he reads the three Collects at the Choir Offices? Should he kneel, or should he stand? To these questions, the rough and ready answer is sometimes made, that he should kneel, because the rubric has, "all kneeling." But this answer can only be made with assurance by those who have not studied the history of the rubric in which the words quoted occur, and who have failed to compare the added words with similar additions to other rubrics referred to above. It is almost certain that in all these cases the added or

altered directions, in regard to *all* kneeling, do not include the Minister, but are addressed to the people only. This is certainly the case in regard to the last two instances named above: the direction in the Confirmation Service is obviously not intended to refer to the Bishop; for had it been so, we should have found some direction for him to stand to give the blessing. In other instances in the Book of Common Prayer, where the Minister has to rise from his knees to continue the Service—*e.g.*, the rubric before the Absolution at Mattins, Evensong, and the Communion—he is expressly ordered to do so. Again, in the fourth case, the direction for the administration of the Elements to the communicants, “all meekly kneeling,” undoubtedly does not include the Minister of the Sacrament, who, of course, must stand in order to administer the Elements. In regard to the rubric in the Service for Public Baptism,¹ there are exceedingly few clergymen who have ever knelt at any time during the administration

¹ “The words ‘all kneeling’ were added to the rubric (in 1661), which here as elsewhere do not apply to the Priest.”—Procter and Frere, *New Hist. of B. of C. P.*, 1901; p. 583 note.

of that Sacrament. In Canon xviii. A.D. 1604, the words, "All manner of persons then present shall reverently kneel upon their knees, when the general Confession, Litany, and other prayers are read," certainly apply to the people only.

Beyond this, there are other considerations which lead to the conclusion that the words of the rubric before the Collects, "all kneeling," do not include the Minister, but refer to the people only. In the Communion Service, in the rubric before the *Miserere*, the words, "Then shall they all kneel upon their knees," refer to the people only; for they are followed by a further direction, "and the Priest and Clerks kneeling . . ." The limitation to the people only, in this direction to "all" to kneel, is quite clear. In the rubric before the Confession at the Communion, we find a similar distinction between the Minister and the people—"both he and all the people kneeling humbly upon their knees." Reference has been already made to the rubric at the reception of the Communion, "all meekly kneeling," excluding the Minister; this interpretation is borne out

by the words in *the Black Rubric*, in which reference is made to the direction in question thus—"Whereas it is ordained in this Office, for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling . . ." Thus the "all" of the rubric before the administration does not include the Minister. And if this is the case in this instance, why not so in that of the rubric before the Collects?¹ Again, in the Communion the rubric before the Collect for the King has, "the Priest standing as before," followed by the direction, "Then shall be said the Collect of the Day," implying that the latter Collect is to be said by the Minister in the standing posture, the people meanwhile "still kneeling." And since the Collect of the Day is to be said at Mattins and Evensong, it seems reasonable to suppose that it should be said by the Minister in the same posture, namely, standing. There is no direction for the Minister to stand for the Epistle or the Gospel, because he is already

¹ "A comparison of other rubrics in the Prayer Book shews that the words *all kneeling* often apply to the congregation only, to the exclusion of the Minister."—*Ritual Conformity*, 4th ed. pp. 19, 20.

in that posture whilst reading the Collect. On the other hand, the people who have been kneeling during the Commandments and the Collect for the King and the Collect of the Day (and sitting, according to ancient precedent, for the Epistle) are expressly required to stand for the Gospel—"Then shall be read the Gospel (the people all standing up) . . ." It is to be observed that in the Prayer Books of 1552, 1559, and 1604, the Priest, at the Communion, was required to read the Collect of the Day and that for the King "standing up." It is hardly open to doubt that as the Collect of the Day at the Choir Offices is borrowed from the Communion, it should be read by the Minister in the same posture as that in which it is read in the latter service.

Any doubt remaining upon the matter is set at rest by an appeal to precedent, which we will now, in conclusion, make. In the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., A.D. 1549, the rubric before the Collects at Mattins was, "The priest standing up, and saying, *Let us pray*. Then the Collect of the day." In the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI., A.D. 1552,

a rubric was inserted directing the Minister at Mattins to stand up before the Suffrages, instead of immediately before the Collect as previously—"Then the Minister standing up shall say, *O Lord shew Thy mercy upon us . . .*," nothing being said as to posture in the following rubric concerning the Collects. Under the Prayer Book of A.D. 1552, the Minister evidently stood for the Collects. In Queen Elizabeth's Prayer Book of A.D. 1559, and in that of King James I., of A.D. 1604, and also in the Scottish Prayer Book of A.D. 1637, no alteration was made in the rubric of A.D. 1552. Thus from the year A.D. 1549 to the year A.D. 1661, *i.e.*, for considerably more than a century, the Priest said the Collects standing, in continuation of immemorial pre-Reformation usage.¹

At the last revision of the Book of Common Prayer, A.D. 1661, the words "all kneeling" were, as it has been said above, added to the rubric before the Collects at Mattins, but not

¹ For an admirable summary of the evidence, see Mr. H. G. Morse's Note in *Hierurgia Anglicana*, ed. Staley, De la More Press, 1903 ; Part II. pp. 31 ff.

at Evensong. It seems reasonable to assume that this somewhat casual addition of the two words, "all kneeling," was made merely to call attention to the duty of the people to kneel in prayer, and that it was not intended to change the immemorial custom of the Church of England, according to which the Minister had always said the Collects standing, even when he said the introductory Versicles kneeling.¹

If the rubric in question, rigorously interpreted, requires the Minister to kneel for the Collects at Mattins, a similarly strict and literal interpretation of the parallel rubric in Evensong would compel him to continue standing whilst saying the Collects at the latter service. It is further to be observed that the Versicles, for which, at both Mattins and Evensong, the Priest is directed to stand up, are the introduction to the Collects which immediately follow—the Versicles and Collects forming one

¹ "The words introduced into the rubric of 1661, *all kneeling*, refer not to the officiant but to the people: they are not inserted in the similar position at Evening Prayer. Such directions for the people were necessitated by the breach of tradition caused through the Great Rebellion and the suppression of the Prayer Book."—Procter and Frere, *New Hist. of the B. of C. P.*, p. 394 note.

whole; it is therefore not unreasonable to assume that the Priest will not change his posture for the Collects. There is, in fact, no English precedent for the Priest's kneeling whilst saying the Collects. Speaking generally, standing is the normal posture for the Minister both at the Communion and at the Choir Offices—when he kneels, it is during the penitential portions of the services: and, moreover, as a practical reason, the standing posture is the best for a speaker or reader who wishes to be heard in any assembly.

Finally, there is no hint whatever in the Book of Common Prayer that the prayers following the Anthem are to be recited by the Minister kneeling, that is, in a posture different from that adopted during the reading of the Collects before the Anthem. "To say the one set of prayers standing and the other kneeling is a private custom which has been introduced into some churches without any authority. It is both reasonable and convenient that the priest should say these prayers, including the Grace, standing up."¹

¹ Dearmer, *The Parson's Handbook*, 6th ed., p. 222.

NOTE ON THE MINISTER'S POSTURE AT THE COLLECTS

A long and interesting correspondence on the subject of the preceding article appeared in the columns of *The Guardian*, from June 10 to July 29, 1891; prominent in which is the following letter, signed, "Aug. B. Donaldson, Truro, June 12, 1891":—

"Standing seems to have been the rule in the Pre-reformation offices, at the recitation of the collects. In the revised Prayer-books the following points are to be observed:—

"*In the first Prayer Book of Edward VI.*, after the Benedictus, there were ordered—'The praiers folowyng, as well at evensong as at matins, all devoutely kneelyng,' viz., Kyrie, Creed, and Lord's Prayer, Versicles, and Responses.

"Then the collects preceded by a rubric ending thus—'The priest standyng up and sayyng.' So in this book versicles were apparently said kneeling, and collects *ordered to be said standing*.

"In the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI., and in Queen Elizabeth's Prayer Book also (as also in the Prayer Book of James I.), the creed is ordered to be said standing,

and then the Kyrie, 'all devoutly kneeling.' After the Lord's Prayer, 'Then the minister standing up shall saye'—Here follow the versicles and collects, without any further order as to kneeling. In these books, apparently, *the collects were to be said standing*; and this is the interpretation given in Cosin's *Notes, Third Series*, p. 450 (Anglo-Catholic Library):—'*Then the priest standing up shall say the versicles.* And he is not appointed to kneel down afterwards at the collects.'

"At the last revision the only alteration made was the addition of the words 'all kneeling,' at the collects. Do these words *in themselves* of necessity include the priest? I think not. Similar words in the Communion Service cannot include the officiant delivering the sacred elements to clergy and people, 'all meekly kneeling.' It is more than doubtful whether in the Baptismal Service the words 'all kneeling,' at the Lord's Prayer, were meant to do more than secure reverence *on the part of the people*. This I believe to be the intention of all these three rubrics, and not as an instruction to the officiant. It was specially necessary to insist upon this at the Restoration, after the long, dreary, irreverent days of the Commonwealth. The words of the MS. book referred to by your correspondent 'Laicus' (not, however, adopted) seem to me really evidence in favour of the standing posture as the practice of the clergy ever since the days of Edward VI. It was desirable (among other matters) to *continue* this; words to that effect were suggested, but not adopted. It by no means follows, as your correspondent and a writer in the *Church Quarterly*¹ assumes, that the practice was forbidden hereafter, because these words were not finally adopted.

¹ No. 64, July, 1891; p. 472.

It may very well have been felt that the traditional posture might be left without a definite order; what was most needed was an instruction to prevent the Puritanical practice of the *congregation sitting* during the prayers.

"In confirmation of this let me call attention to the fact that it was *at the last revision* that the words 'all kneeling' were inserted, not only before the collects, but in the Baptismal Service for Infants (public and private) and in the Confirmation Service (where the Lord's Prayer was added). It is, I think, evident that these had reference to the congregation, and not to the officiant, from the wording of a similar rubric in the (then) new service of baptism of adults, where it is ordered, 'And here *all the congregation* shall kneel,' and, as a consequence, at the Gospel, 'Then shall *the people* stand up, and the priest shall say.' The fact is, that when the priest is to kneel he is almost always *expressly* ordered to do so in the Prayer Book. Compare the rubrics at matins, before the Lord's Prayer, in the Communion Service before the Confession and Prayer of Humble Access, in the Communion Service before the *Miserere*. It seems to me inappropriate for a Bishop to kneel at any of the prayers of the Confirmation rite, or for a priest to do so at any prayer in the Baptismal Service. And the words 'all kneeling,' would, according to your correspondent, compel this.

"There are very good reasons (besides mediæval and early Reformation traditions and rubrics) for standing at the collects as well as at the versicles. Both are linked together, as versicles and collects so often are. The former are an expansion and continuation of the latter, in their petitions for 'peace' and 'grace.' Moreover, as Archdeacon Freeman taught us, the collect of the day is a

specially Eucharistic feature at matins and evensong, and very suitably said in the sacerdotal attitude of standing. It is no mere 'fad' or ignorance that leads many clergy to believe that they are quite correct in taking this posture. They do not think they are guilty of any 'subterfuge,' but are continuing an ancient custom which has a very suggestive meaning."

In *The Guardian* of July 29, 1891, p. 1265, the statement is made :—

"I was well acquainted with the late Rev. W. Darnell, vicar of Bamburgh from 1841 to 1882; it was his practice always to say the collects standing, a practice which, as he told me, he inherited from his father, maintaining that it was the old traditional usage. His father, the Rev. W. Nicholas Darnell, Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxon, where he was Mr. Keble's tutor, was ordained at the end of the eighteenth century, and subsequently became Prebendary of Durham and Rector of Stanhope, where he died in 1865, aged ninety. The late J. W. Richards, also Fellow of Corpus, and tutor to Mr. W. Darnell, observed the same practice. . . . Subsequently he became one of Mr. Druitt's predecessors at Harnham, which he resigned in 1859, in order to join Mr. Keble at Hursley."

INDEX

- ACT OF UNIFORMITY, A.D. 1662, 67 ff.
 Advent, 87, 88, 100, 103, 108, 123, 132, 133, 135, 139, 140, 143, 147, 160
 Aidan, St., 19
 Alban, St., 24, 60, 62, 63
 Aldenham, Lord, 62
 Alexandria, 12
 All Saints, 54, 55, 97, 197, 198
 All Souls, 135
 Ambrose, St., 32, 34, 47, 49, 117, 119, 131, 182
 Ambrosian Rite, 116, 117, 152
Amens at Eucharist, 171 ff.
 Andreas, Johannes, 177
 Andrew, St., 41, 55, 88, 95, 133
 Andrewes, Bp., 182
 Anglican traditions, 2
 Anicetus, 10, 11
 Anne, Queen, 185
 " St., 19
 Annunciation of B. V. M., 39, 85, 88, 90, 91, 100 ff., 198
 Anselm, St., 20
 Anthem, prayers after the, 213
 Antioch, 40, 62
 Antoninus Pius, 175
Apocrypha, 92, 97, 198
 Apostolic Constitutions, 181
 Arles, council of, 11
 Article xxxiv., 6, 16
 Articles, the xxxix, 6, 16
 Ascension day, 90, 103, 135, 147, 148, 153 ff., 200
 Ash Wednesday, 89, 91, 103, 107, 108, 115 ff., 158
 " " collect, 107, 147 ff.,
 Atchley, 177
 Athanasian creed, 95, 202
 Athanasius, St., 20, 113
 Augustine, St., of Canterbury, 13, 14
 " " of Hippo, 11, 33, 34, 119, 121, 131, 182, 183
 Auxentius, Bp., 32
 BACON, LORD KEEPER, 125
 Baptism, 13, 121, 205 ff.
 Barnabas, St., 22, 88, 90, 93, 94, 104
 Bartholomew, St., 71
 Basil the Gt., St., 20
 Bäumer, 37

- Bede, Ven., 13, 14, 24, 54, 60, 62, 63
Benedicite, 123 ff.
 Benedictines, the, 140, 141
Benedictus, 69, 124, 144 ff.
 Bernard, St., 20
 Bill, W., 23, 63
 Bingham, 174
 Bisse, 167
 Black-letter days, 24 ff.
 Black rubric, the, 209
 Blomfield, Bp., 90
 Blunt, J. J., 97
 " J. H., 55, 82
 Bona, Cardinal, 15
 Boniface IV., Pope, 54
Book Annexed, the, 66, 69 ff.
 Bridget, St., 19
 Bright, W., 13
British Magazine, the, 89
 Burial Service, 204

 CABROL, 140, 180, 188
 Campion and Beamont, 75
 Canon xviii., 201, 208
 Cardwell, 23, 27, 72, 73, 82, 185
 Carthusians, the, 8, 9
 Cassian, 115
 Casulanus, 11
 Catherine, St., 51
Catholic Dictionary, A., 117, 140
 Ceremonies, national, 1 ff.
 " Roman, 8
 " variations in, 2 ff., 13
 Charles I., the Martyr, 21, 24, 66 ff., 183
 " II., 68, 73, 185
 Charles II., *P. B.* of, 23, 108, 164, 176, 185, 205, 206, 211
 Charles Borromeo, St., 117
 Chartres, 140
Christian Duty, 178
 Christmas, 94, 95, 132, 134, 147, 159, 160, 203
 Chrysostom, St., 20, 33, 174
Church Quarterly Review, the, 215
Church Times, the, v.
 Churches, dedication of, 36, 41, 44, 46, 49 ff.
 Churching-vail, 126, 127
 Circumcision, the, 94, 156 ff., 160
 Clement, St., 23, 63
 Collection, 202
 Collects, 147 ff., 203, 205 ff.
 " posture of minister at, 205 ff.
 Cologne, 31, 45
 Columba, St., 19
 Commination, the, 166, 208
 Communion, *Amen* after, 179 ff.
 Confirmation Service, 203, 206, 207
 Consecration, *Amen* after, 171 ff.
 Constantine, 30 ff., 44, 45
 Constantinople, 12, 30, 35, 45, 46, 52, 55, 114
 Convocation, 67 ff., 98, 189 ff.
Convocation Prayer Bk., 98, 189 ff.
 Cosin, Bp., 52, 84, 86, 150, 151, 154 ff., 181, 184, 215
 Creffield, 185
 Cross, Invention of, 36, 44, 50
 Cuthbert, St., 24

- Cyprian, St., 43, 56, 62
 Cyril, St., 180
- DARNELL, 217
 Deacon, T., 179
 Dearmer, 213
 Dedication of churches, 36, 41,
 44, 46, 49 ff.
 De Moleon, 7, 140, 141
Depositio, 57
Dict. d'Archéol. et de Liturgie,
 140, 180, 188
Dict. of Bible (Smith), 30
 „ „ (Hastings), 31
 „ of *Christ and the Gospels*,
 188
 „ of *Christian Antiqu.*, 30, 188
Dis. di Erudizione, 30, 31, 33
Dict., A Catholic, 117, 140
 Dionysius of Alexandria, 173
 „ of Milan, 32
 Divine Service, 162, 197
 Domitian, 48
 Donaldson, A. B., 214
 Donatists, 34
 Dowden, Bp., v., 142, 187
 Duchesne, 36, 40, 42, 46, 51,
 53 ff., 111, 112
- EASTER, 10, 87 ff., 100, 102,
 110 ff., 121, 133, 135,
 199
 „ anthem, 199
 Eccles. Discipline, Royal Com-
 mission on, 190, 191
 Edessa, 119
 Edessene Canons, 43, 113, 118,
 119
- Edmonds, Dom, 141
 Edward VI., *First P. B.* of, 4,
 108, 129, 210
 „ „ *Second P. B.* of,
 22, 144, 176,
 210, 211
 Elizabeth, Queen, 24, 26, 59, 60,
 64, 65, 125
 „ „ *P. B.* of, 63, 176,
 210, 211
 Ember days, 132, 137
 English Church, the, 1 ff.
 „ „ Kalendar of,
 17 ff., 58 ff.
 Enurchus (Evurtius), St., 23, 24,
 26, 58 ff., 69
 Epiphany, 29 ff., 45, 94, 95, 132,
 137, 147, 148, 156 ff., 203
 Episcopacy, 83
 Epistle, sitting for the, 210
 Etheldreda, St., 51
 Eton, 64
 Eucharist, the, 11, 14, 43, 49,
 96, 108, 121, 151, 171 ff., 201,
 203, 205 ff.
 Eucharistic *Amens*, 171 ff.
 „ vestments, 199
 Eusebius, 110, 174
 Eustorgius, 30 ff.
 Evening Communion, 166, 196
- FESTIVALS, OCCURRENCE OF,
 84 ff.
 „ transference of,
 91, 92, 102, 103
 Forbes, Bp. of Brechin, 15
 Frederic Barbarossa, 31
 Freeman, 216

- Frere, 58
Frere and Brown, 136
- GAUL, 13, 14
Gelasius, 14
General Thanksgiving, 162 ff.
Genuflexion, 9
George, St., 23, 63
George III., 64
Gervasius, 48, 49
Gibson, Bp. E., 126
Good Friday, 85, 89, 91, 111
Gospel, standing for the, 210
Gospels, the, 49
Granville, Denis, 168
Gregory the Gt., 12, 13, 54, 115
 " II., 116
 " Nazianzen, 20, 118, 119
Grindal, Bp., 23, 63
Grueber, 126
Guardian, the, v., 198, 214, 217
Gunning, Bp., 115, 118, 119, 168
- HABAKKUK, PRAYER OF, 143
Haddon, W., 23, 63
Hayward, 84, 181
Helena, St., 30, 44, 49
Henry VIII., 24
Heraclius, 45
Hereford Breviary, the, 130, 134 ff.
 " *Missal, the*, 120, 200
Heylyn, 93, 94, 127
Hezekiah, Song of, 143
Hickes, 173
Hierurgia Anglicana, 27, 61, 82, 211
- Hippolytus, Canons of, 180
Holy Cross day, 44, 50
Holy days, classification of, 27
 " " occurrence of, 84 ff.
 " " transference of, 91, 92, 102, 103
Holy Innocents, 43, 97, 137, 140, 147, 159, 160
HOLY SPIRIT, invocation of the, 14
Holy week, 101, 102, 198
Hood, 199
Hooker, 12, 15
- IGNATIUS, ST., 20
Introit, 203
 " the Anglican, 196
Irenæus, 9 ff., 109, 110
- JACOBSON, BP., 184
James, St., 44
James I., 65, 92, 126
 " P. B. of, 58, 59, 64, 65, 157, 176, 205, 210, 211
James II., 73
Jebb, 98, 168, 169
Jerome, St., 119, 182
Jerusalem, 44, 45
John, St., 43, 51, 109
 " " Baptist, 85, 145, 146
Johnson, R., 125, 126
Joseph, St., of Arimathea, 19
 " " of Bethlehem, 19
Jubilate Deo, 124, 144 ff.
Julius, Pope, 33
Jus liturgicum, 92
Justin, Martyr, 175

Justinian, 52, 174
Justorum Semita, 28

KALENDAR, THE ANGLICAN,
 17 ff., 58 ff.

Kalendar, compilation of, 17
 „ inconsistencies of, 17,
 18, 25
 „ notes on, 17 ff.
 „ omissions from, 19,
 20, 60
 „ sources of, 18 ff.
 „ summary of, 21
 „ the New, 63, 64
 „ the Hereford, 52
 „ the Roman, 52
 „ the Sarum, 19, 20, 24,
 52, 59
 „ the Westminster, 52
 „ the York, 52, 61

Keble, 83, 217

Kneeling, 119, 205 ff.

LAMMAS, 23, 51, 63

Laon, 140

Lathbury, 72, 80, 82

Laud, Abp., 183

Lawrence, St., 23, 56, 63

Lay Folks Mass Book, 176, 192

Lay-priesthood, 172, 178

Leander, 12

Le Brun Desmarettes, 7, 140,
 141

Lectionary, the, 23, 87 ff., 94 ff.,
 145, 146

Legg, J. W., 63, 152, 199

Lent Fast, the, 10, 105 ff.

Lent, Sundays in, 100 ff., 138 ff.,
 148 ff., 198

Leo the Gt., 182

L'Estrange, H., 183

Litany, the, 163 ff., 199, 200

„ days, 166, 167

„ position of, 166, 167

„ posture at, 200

„ preparation for Eucha-
 rist, 200

Liturgical Year, the, 24

Liturgy, science of, 193 ff.

Lombard, Peter, 172

Luke, St., 97

Lyndwood, 177

Lyons, 8, 140, 141

MABILLON, 32, 36

Magi, origin of the festival of,
 29 ff.

Marcellina, 48

Margaret of Scotland, Queen,
 117

Mark, St., 89, 90

Marriage Service, 202

Martin of Tours, St., 140, 141

Martyrs, 41, 43, 47, 81

Mary, B. V. M., 18, 132, 134,
 135

Mary I., Queen, 177

Mary Magdalene, St., 22

Matthias, St., 89, 91, 95, 103

Maximus of Turin, 33

Merocles, Bp., 31

Michael, St., 52, 53, 197, 200

Milan, 8, 30 ff., 45 ff., 117

Minor holy days, 24 ff.

Montague, Bp., 184

- Month, the*, 9
 Moray, Bp. of, 187
 Moroni, 30 ff.
 Morse, H. G., 211
 Moses and Elijah, fasts of, 116 ff.
 Mozarabic Rite, 116

NATALE, 55, 57
 National ceremonies, 1 ff.
 Nativity of our Lord, 39, 40, 43
 " of St. John Bapt., 39, 40
 Neale, J. M., 116, 140, 141, 152
 Nero, 48
New Week's Preparation, the,
 186
 New Year's Eve, 160
 Newman, J. H., 34
 Nicæa, council of, 113
 Nicholas, St., 51
 Nicomede, 26, 51
 Ninian, St., 19
 Nonjurors, the, 179

 OBLATION, PRAYER OF, 203
 Occasional Prayers, the, 162 ff.,
 Occurrence of festivals, 84 ff.,
 198
 Offertory, the, 201 ff.
 Ordinal, the, 166
Ordo Romanus Primus, 177
 Origin of festival of Magi, 29 ff.
 " of Saints' days, 38 ff.
Origenes du Culte Chrétien, 36,
 40, 42, 46, 51, 53 ff.
 Ornaments rubric, 199
 Overall, Bp. 84, 181

 PALM SUNDAY, 141
 Pantheon, the, 54

 Paris, 140
 Parker, Abp., 23, 63
Pascha, 111
 Patrick, St., 19
 Paul, St., 53, 93, 96
 Paulinus of Nola, 33
 Peter, St., 51, 53
 Philip and James, SS., 54, 90, 103
 Pius V., 9, 101
 Placido Puccinelli, 31, 32
 Polycarp, St., 10, 11, 20, 42, 109
 Prayer Book, A.D. 1549, 4, 108,
 129, 210
 " " A.D. 1552, 22, 144,
 176, 210, 211
 " " A.D. 1559, 63, 176,
 210, 211
 " " A.D. 1604, 58, 59,
 64, 65, 157, 176,
 205, 210, 211
 " " A.D. 1661-2, 23,
 108, 164, 176,
 185, 205, 206,
 211
 " " A.D. 1637, 150,
 183, 211
Prayer Book, the Convocation,
 98, 189 ff.
 Prayer Book revision, 189 ff.
 Prayer for all conditions of men,
 163 ff.
 Prayers, the Occasional, 162 ff.
Preces Privatae, 24, 60 ff.
 Precedent, appeal to, 128, 143,
 150, 155, 156
 Prisca, St., 26
Private Prayers, 61
 Procter and Frere, 82, 207, 212

- Procter and Wordsworth, 131 ff.
 Proper Psalms, 197, 202
 Protasius, Bp. of Milan, 32
 " Martyr, 48, 49
 Purification, the, 101, 134, 135
 Puritans, the, 26, 92, 205
- QUADRAGESIMA, 111 ff.
 Quignonez, 141
 Quimper, 140
 Quinquagesima, 148 ff., 158
- REBELLION, THE GREAT, 205,
 212
 Relics, translation of, 30 ff., 35
 ff., 41, 44 ff.
 Revision of Prayer Book, 189 ff.
 Richard, St., 21
 Richards, 217
Rites of Durham, 24
Ritual Conformity, 151, 156, 209
 Robertson, 93
 Rogation Sunday, 148, 153, 154
 " days, 135, 137, 154,
 155, 203
 " " collect for, 155
 Roman Church, the, 1, 3, 7, 13,
 14
Roman Breviary, the, 101, 141
 " *Missal, the*, 9, 52, 53, 172
 Rouen, 51
 Rubrics, 126, 189 ff., 205 ff.
- SAINTS' DAYS, ORIGIN OF, 36,
 38 ff.
 " " spread of, 56
 Sanctroft, Abp., 151, 154
 Sanday, 51
- Sandys, Bp., 125
Sarum Breviary, the, 19, 131 ff.
 " *Missal, the*, 19, 120, 155,
 159, 200
 " *Pie, the*, 102 ff.
 Saturday fast, 11
 Savoy Conference, 185
 Scarf, 199
Scottish Liturgy, the, 186, 187
 Scudamore, 185, 188
Sealed Books, the, 66, 69, 71, 176
 Septuagesima, 100, 101, 123, 132,
 134, 135, 139
 Services, sequence of, 196
 Seville, 8
 Sexburga, 51
 Shortened Services Act, 197
 Simmons, 176, 192
 Simon and Jude, SS., 85
 Sixtus, Pope, 56
 Smith, I. G., 158
 Smyrna, 42
 Socrates, 114
Some Principles of Prayer Book,
 197
 Sozomen, 12, 114
St. Paul's Eccles. Soc. Trans.,
 62, 63
 Staley, 22, 82, 137, 211
 State Services, the, 70 ff., 96
 Stephen, St., 43, 108, 159
 Stephens, 71
 Stole, 199
 Suffrages, the, 211
 Surplice, 199
- TABLE OF OCCURRENCES, 99,
 104

- Table of Collects, 161
 Taylor, Bp. J., 109
Te Deum, 123 ff.
 " characteristics of, 142 ff.
 " divisions of, 144
 " monastic use of, 139 ff.
 " old English use of, 128 ff., 131 ff.
 Tertullian, 111, 182
Testament of our Lord, the, 180, 181
 Thomas Aquinas, St., 20
 Thorndike, 109
 Thornton, 48
 Thurston, 9
 Tillemont, 32
 Toledo, 8
 " council of, 115
 Tours, St. Martin of, 140, 141
 Transference of festivals, 91, 92, 102, 103
 Transfiguration, the, 18, 120
 Translation of relics, 30 ff., 35 ff., 41, 44 ff.
 " " Edward, C., 50
 " " Edward, K., 50
 " " St. Martin, 50
 " " St. Swithun, 50
 Trinity Sunday, 87, 88, 97, 100
 135, 137
 " 21st Sunday after, 138
VENITE, THE, 199
 Versicles, the, 212
 Victor, Pope, 110
 Victoria, Queen, 73 ff.
 Vienne, 140, 141
 Vigils, 132, 135 ff.
 Visitation of B. V. M., the, 18
Voyages Liturgiques de France, 7, 141
 WARREN, 27, 28, 61
 Western Church, 1
Westminster Missal, the, 52, 120
 Wheatly, 25, 26, 86, 92, 100
 Whitsuntide, 87 ff., 93, 94, 97, 100, 104, 135
 William and Mary, 73, 74
 Wilson, Bp., 186
 Wordsworth, Bp. J., 37, 47, 49, 54, 55, 113, 144
 " Bp. Chr., 173
 Wren, Bp., 184
 XIMENES, 116
YORK BREVIARY, THE, 61, 134
 " *Missal, the*, 120, 200

THE END

**PRINTED BY
WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,
LONDON AND BECCLES.**

Messrs. LONGMANS & CO.'S NEW BOOKS

THE BAMPTON LECTURES FOR 1907.

THE REPROACH OF THE GOSPEL. An Enquiry into the apparent Failure of Christianity as a General Rule of Life and Conduct, with Especial Reference to the Present Time. By JAMES H. F. PEILE, M.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford, and Vicar of All Saints', Ennismore Gardens. 8vo, 5s. 6d. net.

MANKIND AND THE CHURCH : being an Attempt to Estimate the Contribution of Great Races to the Fulness of the Church of God. By SEVEN BISHOPS. Edited with an Introduction by the Right Rev. H. H. MONTGOMERY, D.D., Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Crown 8vo.

GLORIA CRUCIS: Addresses delivered in Lichfield Cathedral, Holy Week and Good Friday, 1907. By the Rev. J. H. BEIBITZ, M.A., Vice-Principal of the Theological College, Lichfield. Crown 8vo.

CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT: being Short Readings on Messianic Passages. By the Rev. B. W. RANDOLPH, D.D., Principal of the Theological College, Ely. With a Brief Introduction by the LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY. Crown 8vo, 4s. net.

THE LAW OF SINAI: being devotional Addresses on the Ten Commandments. By the Rev. B. W. RANDOLPH, D.D. New Impression. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

WHAT IS FAITH? A Hermit's Epistle to some that are without. By the Rev. JOHN HUNTLEY SKRINE, M.A., sometime Warden of Glenalmond. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

THE ONE CHRIST: An Enquiry into the Manner of the Incarnation. By FRANK WESTON, B.D., Canon and Chancellor of the Cathedral, and Principal of the Theological College, Zanzibar. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

HOPE AND STRENGTH : Addresses. By P. N. WAGGETT, M.A., Society of St. John the Evangelist. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

LITURGICAL STUDIES. By the Very Rev. VERNON STALEY, Provost of the Cathedral Church of S. Andrew, Inverness. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

CONTENTS.—National Ceremonies consistent with Catholic Principles—Notes on the Kalendar of the English Church—The Origin of the Festival of the Magi—The Origin of Saints' Days—St. Enurchus: a Liturgical Problem—The Commemoration of King Charles the Martyr—The Occurrence of Festivals and Holy Days—The Lent Fast: Its Origin and Development—*Te Deum* and *Benedicite*, and Alternative Canticles—A Liturgical Perplexity—The Occasional Prayers—On Certain Eucharistic 'Amens'—Prayer-Book Revision—The Posture of the Minister during the Reading of the Collects—Index.

Messrs. Longmans & Co.'s New Books

THE HULSEAN LECTURES, 1905-6.

THE TEMPTATION OF OUR LORD CONSIDERED AS RELATED TO THE MINISTRY AND AS A REVELATION OF HIS PERSON. The Hulsean Lectures, 1905-6. By H. J. C. KNIGHT, B.D., Principal of the Clergy Training School, and Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

PERSONAL IDEALISM AND MYSTICISM. The Pad-dock Lectures for 1906, delivered at the General Seminary, New York. By WILLIAM RALPH INGE, M.A., D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

READINGS FROM LAW'S 'SERIOUS CALL.' With an Introduction by the LORD BISHOP OF LONDON. Crown 8vo. Paper covers, 1s. net; cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

THE MASTER OF THE WORLD: a Study of Christ. By CHARLES LEWIS SLATTERY, Dean of the Cathedral in Faribault (U.S.). Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

In this book the author attempts to interpret Christ in the light of modern scholarship.

The book is divided into two parts:—the first dealing with the sources whence the materials for the study of Christ are obtained, and the second part endeavouring to explain the Personality of Christ in simple language free from technical phraseology.

THE LIFE OF A CHRISTIAN. Some Suggestions for Short Studies in the Spiritual Life. By CHARLES MERCER HALL, M.A., Rector of the Church of the Holy Cross, Kingston, New York. With an Introduction by the BISHOP OF MILWAUKEE. With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST? WHOSE SON IS HE? Pott 8vo, Paper covers, 6d. net.; Cloth, red edges, 1s. net.

This booklet is issued with recommendatory notes by the Bishop of London and the Rev. G. Campbell Morgan.

THE OXFORD LIBRARY OF PRACTICAL THEOLOGY **New Volume.**

SIN. By the Rev. H. V. S. ECK, M.A., Rector of Bethnal Green. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Messrs. Longmans & Co.'s New Books

With a Preface by HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

CHURCH AND EMPIRE. A Series of Essays on the Responsibilities of Empire. Edited by the Rev. JOHN ELLISON, M.A., Vicar of Windsor and Chaplain in Ordinary to H.M. the King, and the Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D., Rector of Lambeth and Hon. Canon of Southwark. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

MYSTICAL FELLOWSHIP: the Science of Christliness. A Catholic Eirenicon from the Exponents of the Mystical Gospel of Brotherliness. Compiled by RICHARD DE BARY. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

This is a Practical Manual of the Mystical Interpretation of the Catholic Faith in those great essentials in which most Christians are commonly agreed. Extracts are given from the various mystical writers arranged under various subject headings.

A COMPANION TO THE PSALTER, consisting of Introductions, Notes, and Meditations contributed as a Help to the Devotional use of the Psalms in Daily Public and Private Worship. By the Rev. J. GURNHILL, B.A., Vicar of East Stockwith, late Diocesan Inspector for the Isle of Axholme, and Scholar of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Second Edition. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

LAWS OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. By B. W. MATURIN, formerly of Cowley St. John, Oxford. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

THE ALTAR AND THE LIFE: Meditations on the Blessed Sacrament in Relation to the Development of the Spiritual Life. By the Rev. JESSE BRETT, L.Th., Chaplain of All Saints' Hospital, Eastbourne. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

THE SERVANT OF JEHOVAH ; or the Passion-Prophecy of Scripture Analysed and Elucidated. By GEORGE COULSON WORKMAN, M.A., Ph.D. (Leipsic), Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Literature in the Wesleyan Theological College. Montreal. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

INNOCENT THE GREAT. By C. H. C. PIRIE-GORDON, B.A. With 4 Maps and 8 Genealogical Tables. 8vo, 9s. net.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF ELIZABETH M. SEWELL, Author of 'Amy Herbert,' etc. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

WORKS BY WILLIAM PORCHER DU BOSE, M.A., S.T.D.

THE GOSPEL IN THE GOSPELS. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. PAUL. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

Messrs. Longmans & Co.'s New Books

OUR SISTER BEATRICE: Recollections of Beatrice Julian Allen and her Letters. Collected by her sister GRACE GRIER. With Portrait. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

This Memoir may be described as an object-lesson in the life of Faith. It gives a short history of the early life, the conversion, and the subsequent history of a woman of no ordinary ability, who in every detail of her daily life strenuously endeavoured to carry out those Christian principles the truth of which she had accepted.

QUIET HOURS WITH THE ORDINAL. A series of Addresses. By the Right Rev. J. W. DIGGLE, D.D., Bishop of Carlisle. Crown 8vo, 2s. net.

CONTENTS.—The Vocation—Reverence for the Bible—Ordination Vows—The Commission.

New Illustrated Edition Suitable for Presentation.

THE DREAM OF GERONTIUS. By JOHN HENRY CARDINAL NEWMAN. New Edition, with Photogravure Portrait of Cardinal Newman and 5 other Illustrations. Large crown 8vo, bound in cream cloth with gilt top, 3s. net.

LONGMANS' POCKET LIBRARY OF THEOLOGY.

Fcap. 8vo. Gilt Top.

Price per Volume, 2s. net in Cloth; 3s. net in Leather.

THE GOSPEL MESSAGE. Sermons Preached in St. Paul's. By the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's.

SERMONS AT ST. PAUL'S AND ELSEWHERE. By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., late Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. Selected from published Sermons by the Rev. H. N. BATE, M.A. Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London, with a Preface by the LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD.

CHRISTIANITY AND COMMON LIFE. By the Rev. H. R. GAMBLE, M.A., Rector of Upper Chelsea.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA



FEB 26 1914

~~OCT 13 '60 H~~

DUE FEB 11 1924

Sumhart

1/14/48

JAN 33 33 33 33

FEB 16 '73 H

~~DUE MAY 27 '49~~

~~DUE DEC 12 '49~~

~~JUN 9 '60 H~~

C 9019.07.5

Liturgical studies /

Widener Library

003642449



3 2044 081 830 812